Truth and Falſhood

Or,

A Compariſon betweene the Truth now taught in England, and the Doctrine of the Romiſh Church: with a briefe confutation of that Popiſh doctrine.

Hereunto is added an Anſwere to ſuch reaſons as the popiſh Recuſants alledge, why they will not come to our Churches.

By Francis Bunny, ſometime fellow of Magdalen College in Oxford.

GAL. 1. 9.

If any man preach vnto you otherwiſe than that ye haue receiued, let him be accurſed.

LONDON

Printed by Valentine Sims, for Rafe Iacſon, dwelling in Paules Churchyard at the ſigne of the white Swanne. 1595.

Peter Constable's Book

Nov.r 2.d 1728

given to him by Mr James

Chapman Min.r at Cromdell

12...882

To the right worshipfull Companie of Ironmongers in *London, Francis Bunny, ſomtime their* Scholer, wiſheth increaſe of knowledge, and zeale of the trueth, with abundance *of all ſpirituall graces heere, and* a happy life with God *elſewhere.*

IF *the children of* Ruben *and* Gad, *might not ſetle thẽſelues to reſt & eaſe til the Lord had caſt out his enemies frõ his ſight, but that they ſhould ſinne againſt the Lord, and their ſinne ſhould finde them out: (for it is great reaſon, that they that haue one inheritance promiſed, ſhould take paines together to get the ſame, and put from it their common enemies) then how much more ſhal God finde vs guiltie, if ſo many and mighty enemies, ſeeking by al meanes poſsible, to keepe vs and our brethren from the poſſeſsion of the trueth here, and ſo from that ſpiritual Canaan, and heauenly Ieruſalem elſe-where, we ſeeking our quiet eſtate, and contenting our ſelues with our owne happy life, do not our indeuour to ſcatter and confound according vnto our place and calling, the common enemies to our ſaluation. When the children of* Ruben *and* Gad, *and the halfe tribe of* Manaſſeh, *had builded them an altar in their countrey, for a remembrance that they were to be accounted Iſraelites, although Iordan parted them from the other tribes, and the reſt of Iſrael had thought that they had builded it to offer ſacrifices vpon the ſame,* the whole congregation of the children of Iſrael gathered them together at Shiloh to warre againſt them. *For they thought it to be euery mans part, to oppoſe thẽſelues againſt Gods enemies, and to be forward in defence of his glorie. Seeing*

Numb. 32. 21, 22

Ioſh. 22. 12.

therefore a common cause requireth common help, and they that doe not keepe a good watch in the place that is appointed vnto them, and in their calling, doe as much as in them lieth, betray the cause: and such as doe not occupie their talent, shalbe Cast into vtter darkenes as vnprofitable seruants: *I haue thought it good, according to my slender skill, and simple talent, to oppose my selfe against our aduersaries, in defence of Gods glorie and the truth: euen against them, who are both the most dangerous enimies to our soules health and the continual disturbers of all common wealths. The first, they indeuour by their false doctrine: the other, by their most perillous and endlesse practises. Insomuch, as of the troubles that are this day in the world, the Cardinall of Loraine seemeth to haue made a true confession euen in the councell of Trent.* For our sakes, brethren (*saieth hee*) is this storme risen, therefore cast vs into the sea. *Indeede not for their sakes onely, but by their meanes, are these troubles come vpon this part of the worlde. Nowe the multitude or malice of our enemies must not discourage vs from doing our duty: but how much more they increase in number, so much the more diligent should we be: and their crueltie and malice should increase our courage against them. But in vaine doe wee withstand them with our tongues and pennes, if the Christian Magistrates doe not put to their helping hand: who haue also their duty to do in the church of God, as wel as they, to whom the ministery of the word is committed* Moses *&* Aaron, *the prince and the priest were brethren, to teach vs what mutuall help the one of them must make to the other. Kings and Queenes (if they forget not their dutie) must be nursing fathers & nurces to Gods church. They must cherish and norish it, they must loue and defend it. And as idolatrous princes, the slaues of antichrist,* haue one mind, and shal giue their power & authoritie to the beast, and shall fight with the Lamb, *as we see it is come to passe in these our dayes: euen so should all godly Princes and Magistrates be ashamed, that zeale of Gods glory, and loue vnto his trueth, should not knit them as fast together, and make them as willing to maintaine the good cause: as superstition, ambition and*

Matth. 25. 30.

Gentil. exam. concil. Trident. sess. 23. lib. 4.

Esa. 49. 23.

Apocal. 17. 12, 13

and malice preuaileth with the wicked, to make them so [illegible] bornly to striue against Gods vndoubted word. Such princes are in scriptures commended vnto vs, as haue beene ready to maintaine trueth, set foorth Gods word, and regarded the sinceritie of the same: and haue on the contrary withstoode superstition, put downe idolatry, and compelled their people vnto the seruice of God, both according to the first and second table of the Commandements. And on the other side, it is left as a staine vnto the memory of others, that they did not take away occasions of idolatry, and remoue such stumbling blockes out of mens wayes. If then we could in such a godly consent, as the Prophet Sophonie saith, serue the Lord with one shoulder: the ciuil magistrates, by the sword, we by the word: they by correction (if neede require) we by exhortations: they by punishments, we by threatnings, remembring that both the one and the other must one day make an account of our stewardship, and answere for our defaults: then I doubt not but God would blesse our godly labors, with great increase of knowlege and godlines. But, as in the end of this treatise, I haue made some exhortation vnto magistrates, to consider of their dutie in this point, so haue I also thought it my part to maintaine to my power, Truth against Falshood euen Gods word against mens inuentions. And for this cause haue I taken this trauell, to set downe the summe of that that we teach, especially in such matters as are principally in question amongst vs: and on the contrary, what our aduersaries teach concerning the same. Which I thought to be necessary, because our doctrine is many times by the aduersaries slandered, especially before such as are ignorant, as though it were far otherwise than in truth it is. And that the truth more easly may appeare, what is taught by them and vs, he that listeth may see with little labor, euen as it were at one view both our opinions. Neither do I vndertake to set downe all that we teach concerning those articles, but onely the points that doe especially belong to the controuersies that are betweene vs. Then also haue I set downe the principall arguments whereby they confirme their doctrines, and indeuour to confute them. Wherein especially I alleadge M. Bellarmines reasons (though not alwayes) because he is accounted learned amongest vs, and also commeth after others, so that he hath seene Zophon. 3. 9.

what others haue, and hath taken out of them what he liketh. And as in all this treatise, my endeuour is to proue (I trust with some good effect) that the doctrine of the church of Rome is not catholike, so that it may the better appeare, I haue towards the end set downe an abridgement of Vincentius Lyrinensis, whereby I trust the meanest that seeth it shalbe able to iudge, how they make an vniust claime to the catholike religion. And although I know my own wants, and could rather submit my selfe to be a scholer vnto many, than a teacher almost of any: yet because (I know not how) my minde giueth me, that this manner of writing may do some good, especially among the vnlearned that are desirous to be taught, I thought my duetie forced me to take this in hand, though I want many helpes and meanes that other haue. And, to whom should this my labour (such as it is) be due rather than vnto you, next after that place where I did sucke as it were my first milke of learning, and laid almost the foundation of that knowledge (such as it is) that God hath indued mee withall? By your good liberalitie, I confesse my selfe to be the better inabled to do any good (be it neuer so little that I can do) in the church of God. To your Worships therefore I confesse this my trauell to be due, as a simple token of my sincere heart, which would haue yeelded a better remembrance, if my abilitie could haue affoorded it. And the rather do I dedicate this Booke vnto your W. Company, that you, seeing the meaning of bestowing your exhibition (which is to bring vp Labourers in Gods harueſt, teachers in his church) to be in some part performed in me, who first in Oxford receiued your liberalitie, as I doubt not but you haue seene much more plentiful fruit in many other, you may the more willingly continue your godly course, and not be weary of your wel-doing. Accept in good part (I pray you) this simple gift, and if you see in it but my desire to doe good, giue glory to God, to whose good grace I commit you and yours, and my selfe to your good prayers. From my house at Ryton in the Bishoprike of Durham,

Anno 1595.

A neceſſarie Table, of all the *principall matters contained* in euery chapter of this Booke.

THAT the Scriptures or word written, is onely Gods word, and not traditions Chapter 1
That this word is ſufficient 2
The Scripture a ſure rule 3
Scriptures eaſie 4
That onely the canonicall bookes of the old and new teſtament are this written word or Scriptures 5
What the catholike church is, that in the creede is mentioned 6
That the catholike church mentioned in the articles of our creede is not viſible or to be ſeene 7
The church here militant vpon the earth may erre 8
Of the markes of the church, or how we may know the true church 9
What a ſacrament is, what is the effect of it, or what it worketh: how many ſacraments there are 10
Of the ſacrament of Baptiſme 11
Of Confirmation 12
Of the Lords ſupper, and Sacrament of the body and bloud of our Saviour Chriſt, and namely of tranſubſtantiation 13
That the wicked receiue not in the ſacrament Chriſts body and bloud 14
That the cup ought not to be denied to the lay people, which thing the papiſts do 15
Againſt their ſacrifice of the Maſſe, or of the altar, as they call it 16
Of true and chriſtian repentance, and of the Popiſh Sacrament of penance 17
Of lawfull calling into the miniſterie, and againſt the ſacrament of Orders, as they call it 18
Of matrimony, that it is not a ſacrament, and that it is lawfull for all. 19
Of anoiling or extreme vnction, that it is not a ſacrament 20
Of originall ſin, what it is, and whether concupiſcence be ſin, or not. 21
Of the works of infidels and ſuch as are not regenerate 22
Of Baptiſme, whether it doe extinguiſh and kill in vs originall ſinne or not 23
That we haue not of our ſelues free wil or power to deliuer our ſelues from

The Table.

from sinne 24
That by our workes we cannot bee iustified: and against the doctrine of merites 25
Of iustification by faith, and what faith is? 26
That good works are necessary duties for all christians to perfourme 27
Of prayer: to whome, and how we should pray 28
Against Images in churches or anie where else for religions cause 29
What fasting is, and of the true vse of fasting 30
Of Purgatorie 31
An Abridgement of Vincentius Lyrinensis, with obseruations vpon the said Author 32
An exhortation to christian magistrates for to defend this truth 33

FINIS.

That the Scriptures, or written word, is onely *Gods Word, and not* traditions.

CHAP. 1

THE PROTESTANTS

The rule of faith & life.

BEcause it is confessed of al, that gods worde must bee the rule and square of our faith and life, of our religion and conuersation: It is very meete, that first wee enquire, what is this word of God? And wee affirme, that that onelie which is contained in the Bookes of the old and new Testament, is the very true word of God. First, bicause we are so often & earnestly charged not to adde any thing to it, or to take any thing from it. Secondly, this

What is gods word

THE PAPISTS

BVt the Church of ROME *not suffering herself to be hemmed in within so narow lists, hath* remoued the ancient bounds which their fathers made, *and faineth, that God (who hath hitherto had but one voice) now in our dayes shoulde speake with two tongues. For they make Gods word to consist of two partes, namely, of the word written, which we cal the Scriptures; and vnwritten, which they call Traditions. And the traditions (say they) were either deliuered by the Apostles themselues*

Prou. 22. 28.

What is gods word in the Church.

Traditions.

THE PROTESTANTS

is prooued by the practise of the godlie of all times. The Iewes most religiously kept the word written with great sincerities, and made it the Touchstone to try their actions by, and by it, they reformed such things as were amisse, in religion especially. As in *Iehosaphat*, *Ezechias*, *Iosias*, and others it may appeare. Christ also and his Apostles confirmed that which they taught out of the Scriptures: yea they confirmed and expounded the Lawe *Mat.* 5. and preached no other gospell thā that which before was *promised by the Prophets*. And accounted them *accursed that shoulde preach any other*. Lastly, the Fathers of the purer times of the Church, did not only with open mouth submit their writings and doctrines to the iudgement of the Scriptures, but also they tried doubts, established all trueths, and confuted all heresies, onely by this word written.

Rom. 1. 2.

Gal. 1. 6, 7, 8, 9.

THE PAPISTS

to some special men, and therfore are called Apostolike, or else are set downe by the Church, and for that cause called Traditions of the Church. Now traditions are made equall, and to be receiued with as great reuerence as the Scriptures, euen by the Counsel of Trent, & the most modest Papists But there are others, who in their excesse of impietie, preferre the traditions before the word written, and make them of greater force than it, as Pighius *in his Ecclesiasticall hierarchie, &* Wolfgangus Screckius. *Nay, in that he wil by traditions haue all doctrines tried he manifestly subiecteth the pure written woorde of God, to the prophane deuises of man.*

Traditions equall with the word.

Sess. 4. decre. 1

Preferred before the word.

Eccl. Hierar. lib. 1. cap. 4. Thes. 9. In his preface.

But to take away the proppes of this their ruinous building, let vs see what grounds or foundations (for so Melchior Canus a learned Papist termeth them) they lay, of this their doctrine.

Melchior Canus in his common places of Diuinitie, and

and Bellarmine in his controuersies, of Gods worde vnwritten, and others also, set this downe as a most necessarie principle, That the Church is more ancient than the Scriptures. As in trueth the Church was more than two thousand yeres before there was any written word of God in bookes, and therefore Bellarmine inferreth, That the Scriptures are not simply necessary. Objection. lib. 3. cap. 3 Bellar. lib. 4 cap. 4.

First, this ground doeth not vpholde that which is in controuersie among vs. For they shoulde prooue traditions to bee a part of Gods worde, so that without them Gods word could not bee counted perfect. And to proue that, they tel vs, that it was more than two thousand yeeres before the woord was written. Which maketh nothing for them, vnlesse they can shew vs, that this word which is now written, is not that same that before was deliuered by tradition vnto the fathers of that old world. For the question betweene vs and the Papists, is not of the maner of deliuering Gods word, whether it were deliuered by word or by writing: but of the matter, namely, whether Gods word be any thing else, than that is written in the old and new testament, which we deny, but they affirme it, because the word was so long time vnwritten, & yet the church was not then without the word. So that because the word was reuealed after an other manner, the Papists wil haue it another word. Whereas in trueth that same word that was from the beginning, is that verie word of God, that was so long after the beginning written for the Iewes, and is now deliuered vnto vs. Wee must therefore take heede that they deceiue vs not by the double signification of the word Scripture, which sometime expresseth the manner of deliuering the word, namely, by writing, and so we confesse, the scripture was not so ancient as the church by mo than two thousand yeares, but sometime the word Scripture signifieth the word it selfe which is deliuered vnto vs, as it is commonly now taken, and in this place must so be vnderstoode. And so hath the Answere. John 1. 1 what word that is that is written.

word written beene from the beginning. That is to say, that the selfe same word, which God, by word of mouth (as we say) and by tradition did teach the patriarkes, hee afterwards did cause to be written, which word wee call the holy scriptures. And further also we must remember, that one manner of deliuering the word of God, is fit for one time, and an other manner of deliuering it for an other time. As may appeare by that which hath beene said, how that God hath in his infinite wisedome seene it needefull, to deliuer it one way afore the Lawe, in an other sort vnder the Lawe, and the Gospell, although not in like measure in both these latter times. So that this argument cannot stand good: The scriptures haue not beene written in the first age amongst the patriarkes, therefore they are not necessary now amongst vs in these dayes, to whom God hath by them reuealed his word. Which argument is strongly confuted by Chrysostome that learned and ancient Father. But to these men, who are (as Tertullian calleth the Heretikes of his time) *lucifugæ scripturarum*, such as shunne the light of the scriptures, and flee from it, I may say as the same Tertullian speaketh in an other place, Beleeue without the Scriptures, that yee may also beleeue against the Scriptures. Let them seeke the desert of their owne deuises, and follow the trod of their owne traditions, to finde out some couert for their superstitions, but let vs content our selues to dwell in the cities of the Lawe, the Prophets, the Gospel, and the Apostles which are the Scriptures, and not goe out of them, as Saint Ierome speaketh, For euery word of God is pure, hee is a shield to those that trust in him. Put nothing to his word, lest he reproue thee, and thou be found a liar.

Diuerse maners of deliuering the word at diuerse times.

In Matth. hom. 1.

De resurrect. carnis.

De prescript.

In Mich. li. 1

Prou. 30. 5, 6

That

That this VVorde is *sufficient.*

CHAP. 2.

THE PROTESTANTS

This word is sufficient.

NOw this written word of God, because it is sent vs frō that most gratious God that hath loued vs, and chosen vs in Christ before the foundations of the world were laide, that we might be holy & without blame before him: and is brought vnto vs by that most excellent Prophet, *In whom are hidden all the treasures of wisedome and knowledge*: and therefore can teach vs, *who also is faithful*, and therefore wil deale truely with vs, yea, who so heartily loueth vs that hee died for vs, and therefore doubtlesse will be careful to teach vs what behooueth vs to knowe: Seeing also the Apostle saint *Paul* doeth testifie, that he kept *nothing backe that was profitable*, but *shewed them all the councell of God*: *We therefore beleeue (the Scriptures) to be writ-*

Eph. 1. 4

Coloss. 2. 3

Heb. 3. 2

Acts 20. 20

27

Ioh. 20. 31

THE PAPISTS

De resurrect. carnis.

BVT the Church of Rome knowing that Tertullian *wrote truely*, That Heretikes, if they be made to proue that they say by the Scriptures, can not stand: *do find fault that they should be so straitly limited and tethered that they may beleeue or receiue nothing but that is in the scripture. And therfore they neither shame nor fear to charge the word written with insufficiencie. For so doeth* Bellarmine *in flat terms. And therfore he*, Melchior Canus, *& the Censure of Collen, & the rest of them, doe out of this principle gather an vnanswerable argument, as they imagin for traditions, because (say they) the Scripture speaketh not of many things necessary to bee beleeued. Are not these such workmen as the Apostle willeth vs to take heede of*, Beware of euill workemen, *yes verily, for they* are de-

Andrad. Orthod. explic. lib. 2

Bellarm. li. 4 cap. 4

Gods word not sufficient.

Phil. 3. 2

THE PROTESTANTS

ten that wee might beleeue, and beleeuing might haue e-
2.Tim.3.16, ternall life. And that the whole ſcripture giuen by inſpiration of God is profitable to teach, to improoue, to correct, and to inſtruct in
17 righteouſneſſe, That the man of God may be abſolute, being made perfect vnto all good workes, that is, that the Scripture is ſo ſufficient and perfect, that it hath no want, it needeth no ſupply, nothing muſt be added.

THE PAPISTS

ceitfull workemen, *if you* 2.Cor.11.13
marke them wel. For whereas they ſhoulde trie their worke by the line and the ſquare, they contrariwiſe trie their rule by their worke. And whereas they ſhould reiect all doctrines that are not agreeable to the word of God, they make that to bee GODS worde that will alowe of their doctrine: ſo that traditions muſt needs be Gods word, becauſe they maintaine that which the Scripture aloweth not of.

The argument for traditions, and againſt the ſufficiencie of the Scriptures.

Many things there are neceſſary to be beleeued, that are not expreſly ſet downe in the Scriptures: yea, many things that are neither plainely neither obſcurely in the Scriptures (ſay all the Papiſts) namely, Canus *in his ſecond and third grounds: Therefore the Scriptures are not ſufficient.*

Lib.3.cap.3

For anſwere: the antecedent or firſt part of the argument is vntrue: For whatſoeuer is to be beleeued, is either plainly ſet downe, or neceſſarily to be gathered out of the Scriptures, otherwiſe our Sauiour Chriſt ſhould not ſeeme to haue plainely dealt with the Iewes, when hee
Iohn 5.39 bidveth them Search the Scriptures (making no mention of any traditions) and addeth his reaſon, They (the ſcriptures) beare witneſſe of mee, but this is manifeſt by the places

places before alleaged. Wherefore S. Augustine doth account him accursed, yea he so pronounceth him, that will teach any thing either of Christ, or of his Church, or anie thing else that appertaineth either to faith, or to our life, besides that which we haue receiued in the Scriptures of the lawe and the Gospel. Marke how he saith: the Scripture serueth vs for all turnes. Therfore the Authour of the vnperfect work vpon Mathew, euen in the beginning, compareth the Scripture to a Store-house of some rich man, wherein one may find whatsoeuer he wanteth: so saith he, in this booke, euery soule may finde that which is necessarie. And Athanasius alluding to the place of S. Paule 2. Tim. 3. 16. saith, The holy scriptures giuen by inspiration, are sufficient to teach vs all trueth. It is therefore far better that we with Tertullian should adore the fulnes of the Scriptures, than be partakers with those heretikes of whom Irene complaineth, who when by the Scriptures they were conuinced, accused the Scriptures themselues, as if something were amisse in them, and that they are not of authoritie sufficient, they are diuerse, and the trueth can not in them be found of them that knowe not the traditions, for they were deliuered, not by writing, but by word: which are the very words of the church of Rome. So that a man can not so aptly paint out our popish heretikes, as if he take his patterne by those ancient heretikes: For not one Ape is liker to an other, than they are.

Contra Ia. Petil. lib. 3. cap. 6

Hom. 1

Contra gentes.

Cont. Hermogenem. Lib. 3. cap. 2

The Scripture a sure Rule.

CHAP. 3

THE PROTESTANTS

The scripture a sure rule.

Psal. 19. 8

AND seeing that God by his prophet *Dauid* hath testified, that *the Lawe of the*

THE PAPISTS

BUt the Papists, who can get nothing but by the crooked measures of their traditions,

THE PROTESTANTS

the Lorde is perfect, and hath by the Prophet *Esay* sent vs to aske counsel
Esay 8. 20 in doubtfull cases, *To the Lawe and to the Testimony.* Yea, and our Sauiour
Luc. 16.27 Christ, when *Diues* mooueth *Abraham* to send some to his fiue brethren, to teach them, sendeth
verse 29 them to Moses and to the Prophets to learne of the, and telleth the Saduces,
Matth. 22.29 *That they erre, because they knowe not the Scriptures.* Lastly, seeing the Apostle S. *Paul* incourageth *Timothie* to keepe well that he had learned, because, saith
2. Tim. 3.15 hee, *thou hast knowen the holy Scriptures of a childe, which are able to make thee wise vnto saluation.* Wee therfore willingly confes & constantly beleeue, that
2. Pet. 1.19 *we haue a most sure word of the prophets, to the which we do wel if we do take heede as vnto a light that shineth in a darke place, vntill the day dawne and the day star arise in our hearts.* And therefore wee doe account this Worde written to bee the most certaine and infalli-

THE PAPISTS

traditions, to bring them into credit with men, do highly commend them, sometime comparing them to The seus his thread, *whereby he was directed out of the laborinth,* Screckius prefat.
and vnto the Touch stone Ibidem.
whereby all doctrine shoulde be tried, and make it as great a fault to breake traditions, Andrad. Orthod. explic. lib. 3 & lib. 8
as if Christ with his owne mouth had spoken them, yea, somtime greater, & so make them at the least equall to the written word, that is, to the vndoubted word of GOD. *And on the other side do altogether deface and disgrace the Scriptures, calling them Inke-Diuines that sticke to* Eckius de scripturis.
them, and comparing them to a Leaden rule, so doeth Eccl. Hierar.
Pighius, *or a nose of waxe,* Explic. dial. 4
as the Censure of Collen doth most prophanely: both the which blasphemous & godlesse reproches against the Scriptures, are defended by
Andradius, *as catholike and* Li. 2. orthod. Explication.
sound sayings, because hee thinketh (as they doe) that they may bee changed and drawen to any interpretation. And therfore they teach Bellar. lib. 4 de verbo non scripto cap. 4 & 5
that the verie Scriptures with-

THE PROTESTANTS

ble rule of our faith or conuersation.

THE PAPISTS

without traditions, are not altogether necessarie. And all this is to perswade the simple, that the Scriptures are not a certaine Iudge of faith or rule of life.

The argument whereby they indeuour to seduce men, and to drawe them to their opinion is this: Whatsoeuer rule of faith or life may be changed, and according to mens affections expounded, is vncertaine and deceitful: but the Scripture is such, therefore it is an vncertaine rule. Argument

Which I answer thus. First, the *maior* or former proposition, is not simply true, but with these additions: whatsoeuer may aptly, or without doing violence to the words, be so drawen vnto sundry opinions, is an vncertaine rule. And hereby will soone be gathered the falsenesse of the *minor*, which affirmeth the scripture to be such. For although out of one sentence of scripture a man may gather diuerse good lessons, and that with good fruit to others, and approbation of all men, so long as those interpretations are agreeable to the rule of faith: yet when any euill thing in faith or life is thereby maintained, without all doubt the words are then wrested, and it ceaseth to bee Gods word. Now this is not the fault of the word, but of mans corrupt affections which abuse the same. For the Lawe truely is holy, and the commandement is holy, iust, and good. Rom. 7. 12.

And as Epiphanius saieth, There is no discord in the Scripture, nor one sentence disagreeing from an other. Haref. 70.

And in an other place, All things in the holy Scripture are cleane enough to them that with godly consideration will come vnto that diuine word, and haue not conceiued in themselues the worke of the Diuell, indeuoring to throw themselues into the pit of death. Euen as saint Paul saith, If our gospell be yet hid, it is hid in them that are lost, in whom the god of this world hath Haref. 76. 2. Cor. 4. 3.

blinded their minds. And what is Gods word the worse,
2. Pet. 3. 16 if the wicked will not know it, or the vnlearned or vnstable peruert it to their owne destruction? I wil therefore conclude with that golden saying of Iustine the martyre.
Iustin. Col. cum Tryphone Iud. I would wish others to be of that mind, that they would not swarue from our Sauiours wordes: For they can put religion into them that wander from the right way, and refresh with most sweete rest, them that are exercised therein.

The Scriptures easie.

CHAP. 4

THE PROTESTANTS

Scriptures easie. WE also teach the scripturs to be easie, not bicause we thinke nothing to be hard in them, or that they are easy to euery one, but we affirme with *Chrysostome*, *All that is necessary is easy in them*. So that with
2. Thess. 3 hom. 3. a mind humbled, and crauing of God to be instructed, men study them. The simple may learn by them their duety towardes God and man, and how to behaue them selues in their particular dueties. And whereas by the Papistes own confessiō the x commandements are very easie, no man can deny but
Bellarm. de verbo Dei lib. 3. cap. 2. that Gods threatnings against

THE PAPISTS

AND on the contrary, the church of Rome fearing least the light of the worde should discouer the darkenes of their blind deuotions, doe what they can to discourage the people from being exercised in the Scriptures, lest knowing the truth, they should detest their superstitions and idolatries, and for this cause they cry out with opē mouth, that the scripture is too hard to bee vnderstoode, and too darke for ignorant men to meddle with the same. Wherby they haue brought many ignorant and lay men into that foolish and vnchristian conceit, that they thinke it a great deale more dangerous for

THE PROTESTANTS

gainſt ſin, & the promiſes of mercy, and many other things in this writte word are as eaſie. Yea why were the prophets ſent vnto all ſorts of men, why do the apoſtles write vnto all, but becauſe much, if not all that they do write or ſay, might be vnderſtoode euen of the ſimple?

THE PAPISTS

for them, euen for their ſoules health, to be occupied in reading or hearing ſome peece of holie Scripture, than the wanton and vnchaſte Bookes of prophane men, which corrupt good manners, and breede noyſome luſtes that fight againſt the ſoule.

But becauſe this is a great ſtumbling blocke in the way of the ignorant, it ſhall not be amiſſe ſomewhat particularly to examine the Arguments that are vſed to proue the hardneſſe of the ſcriptures. The firſt argument of Bellarmines is this. Dauid prayeth thus, Giue me vnderſtanding, and I wil ſearch thy law. Open mine eies, and I will conſider the woonderous things of thy lawe, ſhew the light of thy countenance vpon thy ſeruant, & teach me thy ſtatutes; therefore the Scriptures are hard. Lib. 3. cap. 1. de verbi Dei interpr. Argument

It is certaine that Dauids prayers were not to haue his naturall or outward man only inſtructed (for who can imagine that the prophet Dauid, being ſo well acquainted in Gods booke, could not vnderſtand Gods lawe) but to haue his mind and inward man lightned and directed: and therefore this proueth not the ſenſe of ſcripture to be hard: for the like prayers are to be vſed of them that thinke it to be moſt eaſie. Secondly, euen the lawe, which they confeſſe to be eaſie, hath not only the literall ſenſe, but ſhould alſo be a bridle vnto the affections and thoughts of men, as moſt plainly appeareth in thoſe Commentaries which our Sauiour Chriſt maketh vppon the ſixt, ſeuenth, and fourth commandements. In which reſpect alſo S. Paul doth call it Spirituall, although Bellarmine ſeeme to account the Anſwere. Matth. 5. Rom. 7. 14.

commaun-

commandements to be but Natural. The Precepts (saith he) of the x. Commandements, seeing they are natural, may easily be vnderstood. Dauid therfore may there pray (as all christians ought to doe) that he may know by Gods word, not only how to rule his actiõs, but also his words & affections. This thẽ doth not proue the scripture to be hard concerning such good lessons as out of the literal sense may be learned, but he proueth that vnlesse God lighten vs, we cannot see the spirituall meaning, which he calleth, the maruellous things of the law. His second argument proueth some parts of Scripture to be hard, which we denie not, and therefore deserueth no answere.

Psa. 119.27.

Arg. 2

Arg. 3

His third argument is taken from the Fathers. Irene saith, in the scriptures I commit many things to God. Orig. saith, the scripture is darke in many places. And in another place, that we must pray night and day, that the lamb of the Tribe of Iuda will come, and that hee will vouchsafe to open the booke that is sealed. That many things in the scripture are hard we neuer denied, as before I said, and that with Reading wee should ioyne Prayer, therefore Bellarmine when he took these weapons in hand, did but feare his owne shadow. That Basil and Gregory Nazianzene did seeke, not by their owne presumption, but by other mens writings that were before them, to attaine to the vnderstanding of this written word, Ruffinus doth well to commend them. But I am sure that Bellarmine himselfe will not thereof conclude, that they vnderstoode nothing of themselues or without teachers, or that all the scriptures are hard. He bringeth in Chrysostome saying, that the deepe things therein cannot be attained vnto without great labour, and that Christ would haue the Iewes not to reade onely, but to search them also. If of this hee conclude therfore, al the scriptures are hard, his argument is to be denied, for that it hath no trueth in it: if hee say therefore, many things are hard, we say so with him. Hee alleageth saint Ambrose also, who saith, The holy scrip-

Lib. 2. ca 47 Contra Celsum lib. 7 In Exod. hom. 13

Answere

Argument

ture

ture is a sea. Saint Ambrose doth not in that place call it a Sea, because it is so deepe that the bottome can not be found, but because it is so plentifull that it yeeldeth abundance to all, as appeareth, not only by the sentence next after that alleadged by Bellarmine, but also by that conclusion that he gathereth a litle after, saying: Therefore the holy Scripture hath diuers riuers, Thou hast to drinke the first time, the second time, and the last time. Therefore, although saint Ambrose say, that the scripture hath in it depths, yet doth he not say it is all darke. But (saith he) Hierome in his epistle to Paulinus writeth, that without a teacher the scriptures can not be learned, and briefly going through euery booke by name, hee sheweth, that in them are many and great difficulties, or rather mysteries, for he findeth in them sundry allegories. Yet all is not hard, as before hath often bin answered. And S. Ierome in that place as soone as hee hath made an end of reckoning vp of those bookes, and shewing the mysteries that are therein, he sheweth the cause why he did so: I would not (saith he) haue thee to be offended with the simplicitie and baseness of wordes in the Scriptures. As for the other obiection out of Hierome, is, that Hierome was studious in the scriptures from his youth, and also went to Alexandria to conferre with Dydimus of all that he did doubt of in the scriptures. The simple may see, this maketh not against vs: Hierome studied them hard, therefore all the scriptures are hard: Or, he conferred with Dydimus of that he doubted, therefore all are hard. The last obiection out of Hierome is, That the whole Epistle to the Romaines is wrapped into great obscurities. This toucheth but onely that epistle, and therefore is no argument against all the scripture. And in that, seeing there be many things both concerning faith and manners very plaine, saint Hierome either speaketh hyperbolically as many times the fathers do, or else by these obscurities he meaneth such mysteries as may be gathered out of the scriptures, but not

Answere.

Argument.

Answere.

Argument.

Obiection.

Answere.

such

such doctrines as we must learne out of the same. And who knoweth not that the fathers do many times soare higher, and find out greater mysteries, than the text will well afford. Out of Augustine he hath foure testimonies. The first saith, that such as rashly reade, are many times troubled, because that some things that are obscurely spoken do greatly blinde them. Which maketh not against vs, that neither like of rash reading, neither say that all is easie. His second testimony is that exclamation that saint Augustine maketh, hauing entred into a deepe meditation what may be signified by these words heauen and earth in the beginning of Genesis, as appeereth by the chapter going before, and also by sundry of the chapters following, & therefore this his admiration, O the wonderfull depth of thy words! &c. doth not proue all the scripture to be hard. May seeing that the story of the creation may there bee plainely vnderstood, it must needes follow, that his meaning was not to say that Gods word is hard, but rather, that men may in the same consider of deepe matters, as I answered to the last place out of S. Hierome. The third and fourth places out of saint Augustine are these: There is so great depth of christian learning, that I might therein profit daily, if from my childhoode vnto my olde age, with much time, earnest indeuour, and a sharper wit, I could study it only. And lastly, In the holy Scriptures I know (saith Augustine) not so much by farre as I am ignorant of. Both which places do proove nothing else than, as I said before of Ambrose, that the scriptures are plentifull. So that he saith heere nothing else than in another place of that third epistle, out of the which the former of these two places is taken, The maner (saith he) of speaking vsed in the Scriptures al may come to, but very few can passe through, and so afterwardes sheweth howe sundry good things all may receiue by them. Lastly, the two testimonies, out of the Author of the vnperfect worke vpon Mathew, and that out of Gregory vppon Ezech. Hom. 6.

Obiection

Answere.

Confess. lib. 12. cap. 14

Obiection

Answere

Hom. 44

which

which giue two reasons why the scriptures are obscure, are also like the rest, nothing against vs. For the author of that worke vpon Mathew doth plainly shew in the same homily, that he meaneth, the scriptures to be obscure to them that will not reade them, these are the words: Therefore the truth is not hid in the Scriptures, but it is darke, not so that they who seek it may not find it, but so as they can not find it that wil not seek it. And the same also appeares by the words of the place alleaged out of Gregory by Bellarmine. For one reason of the obscuritie is, saith he, that he may get that by labour, which by idlenes he can not. And then also because the knowledge of the scriptures is not gotten but by labour and paines taking, they are not so lightly esteemed.

The last generall argument is, by reason, to proove the scriptures to be hard, both in regard of the matter deliuered, and the maner of deliuering it. And here for the matter he reckneth some of the principal points of diuinitie, wherein as we may find in the scriptures milke for children, that is, easie lessons for the ignorant, and meate for the elder sort. Yea, as Augustine saith, He giueth milk to yong ones, that when they are elder hee may giue them stronger meate. And as the matters contained in the scriptures are heauenly and spirituall, so the heauenly minded man, and he that is spiritually minded shal iudge of al things. And it shall not be vnperformed that God hath promised, The secret of the Lorde is reuealed to them that feare him, and his couenant, to giue them vnderstanding.

Arg. 4

Answere

De verbis dom. ser. 38 fulgent. ser. de confessor.

1. Cor. 2. 15

Psal. 25. 14.

Now, for the maner of speaking, although it is true that there are in the scriptures speeches hard, by shew of contrariety, by doubtfull and vnperfect speeches, because one thing is set before another, because of the proprietie of the Hebrew phrase, and of the figures (for these sire he setteth downe the things whereby hardnesse may be in the scriptures by the maner of deliuering them) yet neither are these things so common or so strange, but that the godly

may of the ſcriptures gather much fruit, if they will diligently, and with calling vpon God for help reade the ſame. So that in briefe this is all that theſe fathers haue ſaid, either that many things are hard, which no body denieth, or elſe, that none can ſo ſound the depth of them, but that ſomething may alwayes be added thereto: and therefore that with diligence the ſcriptures muſt be ſearched, and without loathſomneſs, yea with reuerence receiued. But that wee may the more eaſily and euidently ſee how little theſe fathers do make for them: it is neceſſary to ſee with what purpoſe, and to what end theſe ſay, that they do write of the hardneſſe of the ſcriptures. Namely, not to diſcourage men from reading of them, but to ſtirre them vp to more diligence and carefulneſſe in reading them. As may appeare by the earneſt and vehement exhortations, which the ancient fathers doe make, not onely to all men generally, but euen to lay men in particular and eſpecially. Heare (ſaith Chryſoſtome) all yee lay men that are preſent, and that haue wiues and children, howe the Apoſtle commandeth euen (you eſpecially) to reade the Scriptures, and not to reade them only as it were by chance, but with great diligence: with many other ſuch like exhortations in that place, as alſo in many other of his writings. Saint Hierome in ſundry of his epiſtles vnto godly women exhorteth them to diligent reading of the ſame, he alſo, to intice them to be conuerſant therein, dedicateth vnto ſome women ſom of his treatiſes vpon the ſcriptures. Yea, and in his preface vnto Paula and Euſtochium two women, before his firſt booke vpon the epiſtle to the Epheſians (which is the place out of which Bellarmines ſecond argument out of Hierome was fetched) doth highly commend the ſtudy and knowlege of the ſcriptures. And in his preface vnto his ſecond booke, doth extoll Marcella, for her diligent ſtudy therein, preferring her before himſelfe, Thou wilt ſay (ſaith Origen) the ſcriptures are hard, yet it is good to reade them. And wiſheth that we all would doe

Hom. 9. in epiſt. ad Coloſſ.

Hom. 20. in Ioſ.

as

as it is written (namely) Search the Scriptures. Cornelius Agryppa reporteth, that in the first Nicent councell it was decreed, that no christian man should be without a bible in his house. And Chrysostome exhorteth euen lay men, and that very earnestly, to get them Bibles, or at the least the new Testament. So then wee see to what intent the Fathers tell vs, that the Scriptures are hard, namely, because they would not haue vs to be careles in the study of them, and negligent, or to imagine when wee knowe somewhat, that we neede knowe no more, but as Hierome would haue vs to doe, We must cracke the nut, if wee will eate the kernell. We must take paines to get knowledge, assuring our selues that wee can neuer learne too much, because wee can neuer knowe enough. And saint Augustine in his Confessions saith, they ought to be read of all. But the Papists, in complaining of the hardnes of the scriptures, shoot at an other marke, that is, to make the simple people afraide, that they meddle not with it, that they reade it not, neither yet heare it read vnto them. So that besides the other slaunders wherewith they seeke to staine Gods word, proclaiming it not to be sufficient, but that it wanteth many things, and may be wrested to any sence, they adde this also, that it is hard, and therefore dangerous for them that are not learned to reade it. And this is the very cause why they speake so much of the hardnesse of the scriptures, as not onely their writings and words proclaime in all places, but also their cruell executions against such as haue had in their mother tongue, I say not the bible or the New Testament, but euen the Lordes prayer, or the tenne commaundements, which they would seeme to allow vnto the people.

De Vnitate Scripturarum.

Hom. 9. in Colos.

Epistol. ad Paulinum.

Lib. 6. cap. 5.

Fox lib. 8. Acts and Monum. in the beginning.

Gregory Nazianzene doth write, that some ancient men amongst the Hebrewes report of a custome which the Iewes had, which he also commendeth, which was, that some places of the scriptures were not permitted to any

In Apologia.

body to reade before they were five and twentie yeeres old, but the rest of the Scripture they should learne, euen from their childehoode. Where note that they make no difference of any state, calling, or sexe, but of age onely, and that when they were fiue and twentie yeares olde, they might reade any parcell of Scripture. But the Papists permit not any parcell of the scriptures to the lay people, nay hardly to their priests, but onely as they will followe such sence thereof as they appoint. Yea, I haue knowen bachellors of diuinity admitted to reade some booke of the master of sentences, as the vse then was when they proceeded, so that this was their conclusion: They are hard, therefore you shall not reade them. That the scriptures are so hard as they are, and to so many, none are to bee blamed but the church of Rome, that so much complaineth of their hardnesse, but in trueth are sory they are so easie: as is most plaine to see, first, in that they would not haue them in the mother tongues, but when they see there is no remedy, but that the scripture will be published whether they will or not, they send vs a Testament from Rhemes, so full of Hebrew, Latine, and Greeke wordes, turned into English letters, that all the world may see that they meane nothing lesse, than that they that reade it should vnderstand it. And yet they cry, The scripture is hard. Secondly, they are the cause of the hardnesse of the scriptures, when in the most plaine places that are, they will not suffer men to follow that sence, which the words themselues, and the circumstances both before and after doe afford, but they must haue their interpretation from the church of Rome, without whose approbations they must neither trust their own eies for seeing, nor their eares for hearing, neither yet their wit for vnderstanding of any thing. When they change the very sence and wordes, and where they finde Lord, they put Lady, as in that blasphemous booke called the psalter of the Virgine Marie they doe through the whole psalmes, and some other places.

Papists to be blamed for hardnesse of the Scripture, by their

Translations,

Interpretations.

When

When the first promise that was made of that blessed seede that should breake the head of the serpent, they apply as much as they dare vnto the Virgine Marie, when these wordes shall be currant stuffe, to proue worshipping of the Saints departed (In as much as yee haue doone it to the least of these my brethren, yee haue doone it vnto mee, which are spoken of our goodnesse to Gods needy creatures alive) as Eckius imagineth in his common places: when (I say) the people are taught thus to vnderstand the scriptures, must they not needes bee hard? Lastly, the greatest cause of this hardnesse, is, that the people are not acquainted with them, for they are forbidden to reade them: nay, it hath beene death to haue them found with the lay people. And still there are, that in corners seeke to perswade ignorant men and women, that there can be almost no greater daunger vnto their soules, than to reade the scriptures. Wherein they shew themselues to be nothing of the minde of Phillip, who forbade not the Eunuch to reade the scripture, but taught him: neither like to the fathers of the church some hundreds of yeares after Christ, whose care was to exhort and draw the people to the diligent reading of the same. And whosoeuer they are, that with diligence, humilitie, and prayer, doe continue in the reading of the scriptures, (as wee see in sundry by experience) shall be able in reasonable maner to auoyde and passe through those fiue impediments that I before alleaged out of Bellarmine, and shall haue mindes exercised, as the Apostle to the Hebrewes speaketh, and that not without great fruit, to discerne good and euill.

Math. 25. 40

De verbo Dei.

Forbidding to reade scriptures.

Acts 8. 31, 35

Cap. 5. 14

And thus wee may see how little the fathers make for that which the church of Rome teacheth in this point. For the fathers say thus: The scriptures are hard, therefore you must reade them diligently. The church of Rome cleane contrary: The scriptures are hard, therefore you must not reade them. Therefore let vs detest as a most pestilent position that daungerous doctrine of the church of

Rome, knowing, that whosoeuer (be hee neuer so ignorant) with reuerent reading seeketh to finde, and with deuout prayer asketh knowledge of God, shall finde much knowledge and comfort in his godly and christian exercise.

Hieron. pf. 147. For, The word of God is most fat and fertile, It hath in it all delicates. And thus to conclude: seeing the scriptures onely are Gods word, and they are so sufficient and plentifull, that in them the hungry may haue foode, the poore, treasure, the rich, direction, the sicke, physicke, the whole, diet, the sorrowfull, comfort, the ignorant, knowledge, and the foolish, true wisedome: to be short, seeing there for all wants we finde a remedy, and seeing that rule is so true that it cannot deceiue, so straight that it can not be crooked, so constant to it selfe that it changeth not: lastly, seeing it is so easie, that by diligence and prayer, the godly may not learne onely, but grow and increase daily from knowledge to knowledge, let vs account them as deadly enemies to our soules, who seeke to drawe vs from this sufficient and certaine written word of God, to the doctrines or traditions of men, what glorious names soeuer they giue them. What shall wee then account of the popish crew that are not ashamed to teach the Scriptures to be daungerous, because euill men abuse them, so doth the drunkard, drinke, the glutton, meate, the prowd, apparell, the couetous, riches, and the euill men, all Gods graces: yet all these thinges are good, and so is Gods word holy and undefiled.

But nowe to the second point.

That

That only the Canonicall bookes of the old and new Testament are this written word or Scriptures.

CHAP. 5

The Protestants

SEing that the rule of the Catholike faith *must be knowen, and certaine, for if it be not knowen, it can not be a rule vnto vs, if not certaine, it is no rule at all*, as Bellarmine hath very wel noted, & only those scriptures which we according to the ancient vse of the Primitiue church, and the common consent of those purer times, do call Canonicall, are that sure rule that can not deceiue (for therefore haue they that name, because they are for triall of doctrines, as the rule or line for triall of workes:) it is certain that no other word can be that infallible word of God & certaine rule of faith and religion, but only the Canonical Scriptures. These onely haue beene of the godly Fathers accounted to haue beene written by those

De verbo dei lib. 1. cap. 2.

The Papists

NOtwithstãding this name Canonicall which the ancient fathers haue giuen to these Scriptures onely, to testify that they are only the certaine canon and rule of faith, notwithstanding also such preheminence and excellency, as not the Fathers onely, but themselues also doe yeelde vnto the Canonicall scriptures to be of all other the most certaine rule, and most infallible touchstone in all matters of controuersie, the Councel of Trent is not ashamed to commaund (and that vnder paine of beeing accursed) to receiue these bookes that are contained in the Bible, with like reuerence and deuotion, and to make them of as good credite as the canonicall Scripture: I say, euen those Apocryphaes, in which are many things absurd, and whose very name sheweth them to be vnknown

Bellarm. de verbo Dei li. 1. ca. 2. compared with that cap. 4.

THE PROTESTANTS

those whom God indued with his spirite for that cause: Out of these onlie the Fathers permit matters of controuersie to bee tried. And in expounding of these that wee call Canonicall, they haue bestowed their godly labours: yea and them onely to bee certaine, and such as were neuer doubted of among Catholike men, *Bellarmine* himselfe confesseth, and it is a ground or principle acknowledged of all men.

Concil. Laodicenum ca. 59. Hieron. ad Paulinum & prologo Galeato.

De verbo dei lib. 1. cap. 4.

THE PAPISTS

from whence they came, who were not found in the Hebrew, nor accounted by the Iewes to be Canonicall. And so they doe match that word, that all men alwayes, and euen themselues acknowledge to be lesse certaine, with that which they knowe that no good man euer doubted of.

But lest they should seeme thus to dote without reason, they vse in effect these arguments for proofe heereof. The Argument first is, that these bookes which we call Apocrypha, are alledged sometimes of the Fathers in their writings. But the Answere answere is easie. For the alledging of them doth not proue, that they who alledged them did hold them for canonicall, for then should it followe, that poets, philosophers, and such like (who are often alledged by the ancient writers) should so be. But this rule must stand alwayes good which S. Hierome hauing reckoned vp those bookes which now in our Bibles are accounted canonicall, and no other, hath, Whatsoeuer is besides these must be put amongst the Apocrypha. Yea to be short, they do alledge them, because they may bee read to the edifying of the people, but not to confirme the authoritie of any ecclesiasticall doctrine, as saint Hierome saith of Tobie, Iudith, and the Machabees, and Ruffinus also vppon the Creede.

Prologo in lib. Reg. qui Galeatus dicitur. Ruffinus in symbol. prolog in Proverb.

The second argument is taken out of Augustine, because he reckoneth vp the books which we call Canonicall, and

De doctrina christian. lib. 2. cap. 8.

and also the Apocrypha, and calleth all Canonicall. So doth the third councell holden at Carthage also, with some other ancient writers. Admit that this were the meaning of saint Augustine, and of those Fathers, shall their bare authority without reason be heauy enough to weigh down so many fathers and reasons, as (partly) I haue alleaged to the contrary, and might haue alledged many mo: But their meaning is plaine enough. For although S. Augustine, and that Councel of Carthage, and others say, that all those bookes are canonicall, yet wee must vnderstand them according to their meaning. They diuided all the scripturs, that went in the name of scriptures, but into two parts. Those which they called Apocrypha, had many fables, as may appeare by saint Augustine: now all the rest they called Canonicall, so that they comprehend vnder that name, all that Eusebius and others do vnderstand, both by such bookes as were without all controuersie receiued of al men, and such as were not generally receiued of all, but well liked of many. And they comprehend all these in one name, not only because that in comparison of the other that were fabulous, these were good, but also because they were read commonly of them, although not for establishing of anie doctrine, as before I haue shewed, yet for reformation of manners. And that S. Augustines meaning was not, to make like account of all, appeareth not onely by that rule which himselfe setteth downe, in that very chapter, after he hath reckoned vp those Bookes canonicall, Those canonicall bookes which are generally (saith he) receiued by the common consent of all Churches, are to bee preferred before them that are reiected of many (but of those whom we call Apocrypha, Origen, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Melito, Hierome, Ruffinus, and many other haue doubted) but also by his practise. For it will appeare how that somtime himself doubteth of some of them, which we deny to be canonicall, namely of the Machabees he writeth thus against the second Epistle of Gaudentius the

Cap. 47 answers.

De ciuit. Dei lib. 15. ca. 23 lib. 3. cap. 25 Euseb.

De doctrina christiana li. 2. cap. 8. So

Lib.2,cap.23 Donatist, This peece of Scripture of the Machabees, the Iewes do not so account of as of the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalmes, vnto the which the Lord giueth testimony as vnto his own witnesses, saying, Al things must be fulfilled which are written in the Law, the Prophets and the Psalmes of me, but it is receiued of the Church, not without profite, if it bee read or heard soberly. Wherin first I note, that the Iewes, with whom the word of God was kept, before it came to vs, did not account it canonicall. Secondly, note how he magnifieth the witnes of the scriptures which are indeede canonical, calling them the Lords owne witnesses: And thirdly, how coldly hee intertaineth the bookes of Machabees, saying, the church readeth them, and that with profit, if they be read soberly, by reason of some good examples in them. But yet more
Lib.18.c.36. plainely in his Bookes of the citie of God. The reckoning of time (from the restoring of the Temple) is not found in the holy Scriptures that are called Canonicall, but in other writings, amongst which are the Bookes of the Machabees, which the Iewes reckon not canonicall, but the church doth, bicause of the extreame & strange sufferings of some Martires. Wherein wee see how that S. Augustine saith, that wee knowe not the story of those times, after the temple was built by any canonicall writer, but yet by the Machabees wee know it, therefore the Machabees are not canonicall: And yet the church accounteth them (saith he) canonicall, because of the examples of the Martyres in them: As if he would haue saide, Although those Bookes be not indeede such as you may build your faith vpon, yet they are for some things worth the reading. Which two places I stoode vpon the rather, because Bell-
De verbo dei lib.1,cap.15. armine alledgeth them, especially this latter, as a speciall pillar to hold vp those Bookes of Machabees. But howe truely, let the Reader iudge.

Arg. 3 Their third and last argument is taken from that authority which they imagine the Church hath to approoue or disprooue

disproue Gods word. And therefore is it so often repeated by Bellarmine handling this point, That the Councell of Trent hath allowed such Bookes. So that hee iumpeth right with that which most blasphemously Eckius hath set downe, & that twice within few lines (he liked so well of it,) That the Scriptures are not authenticall (or canonicall,) without the authoritie of the church. And Canus setteth himselfe to make a full discourse against them, that say, That the Scripture needeth not the approbation of the church. And thus they must reason. The church hath allowed those bookes to be canonicall which you call Apocrypha, according as did also the ancient fathers, therefore they are canonicall. That the weakenesse and wickednesse of this argument may appeare, let vs first consider who is the Author of the holy scriptures, which the Apostle declareth as plainly as can be when he saith, The whole scripture is giuen by inspiration from God. Therefore the scripture is the word, not of man, but of God. Secondly, let vs see how this word came to vs, whether by tradition of the church or by special reuelation. Which also is plainly answered by saint Peter, saying, that prophecie came not in olde time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were mooued by the holy Ghost. What will we then say? shall we imagin that God would direct by his holy Spirite the mouthes of his seruants to speake, but not their pennes to write? God forbid. Thirdly, the men whome it pleased God to vse as his meanes in setting downe this word, were knowen vnto the church of that time wherein they flourished, and their calling so confirmed vnto the godly, that without all doubt or wauering they receiued those writings as Gods word, because they knew the authors thereof to be directed by Gods spirit.

De verbo dei lib. 1. De eccles.

Lib 2. de locis Theol. ca. 6

Answere.

2. Tim. 3. 16.

2. Pet. 1. 21.

And this is the difference that the ancient fathers doe make, betweene those Bookes of scripture, whose authors were knowen, and their bookes alwayes receiued, and

for

therefore called Canonicall, that is, such as deliuer rules for life and doctrine that are infallible: and those other that are called Apocrypha, because either it was not knowen who wrote them, or else it was not knowen that they were indued with such a spirite, as they could not erre in any thing. And therefore their Bookes were not receiued of the church then. Is it not then intollerable pride in the church of Rome, to commaund silence vnto God himselfe, and not to suffer him to speake, but when they giue him leaue, and to proclaime it vnto the world, that euen his word is not of credite, vnlesse it be by their approbation and allowance of the same. And yet thus doe they say when they affirme, that the Scriptures are not Canonicall, but by the approbation of the Church. Yea, some make them no better than Esopes Fables, if the Church allowe not of them. O blasphemie intollerable! if this their argument might ber allowed, then the church of Rome, which falsely challengeth to bee the church, would soone prooue their abhommable Idolatries and heresies, to be true religion. And therefore doe they challenge this authoritie, and striue for it. And the Pope sometimes dispenseth against the Apostle, as their Canonists doe note, and sometimes a Councell dispenseth against the apostle, and all this is, to challeuge vnto their church this prerogatiue, that it may deale with Gods word as it will.

Caus. 15. Quæst. 6. ca. Autoritatem. Dist. 34. c. lector. dist. 61. presbyt.

When Gregorie the thirteenth pope of that name confirmed the order of the fellowship of the blessed virgine Marie (a new deuised order, and come vp since the order of Iesuites) in his Bull hee confirmeth and ratifieth all such priuileges as they haue or shall haue, Notwithstanding anie Constitutions or Ordinances Apostolike, or whatsoeuer may be against it. Did you euer reade or heare any speake more like the beast mentioned in the Apocalips, who had a mouth giuen vnto him that spake blasphemies? But to be short, I will against their argument

Apoc. 13. 5, 6

oppose

oppose this. Whatsoeuer scriptures are not giuen by inspiration of God spirit, and by the godly receiued into the canon of the scripturs, those are not the word of God, though they haue the approbation of the latter churches: but such are the Bookes which wee call Apocrypha, which the councell of Trent would make of like authoritie with the canonicall Scriptures, therefore those Bookes are not the vndoubted word of God. And howe can any body imagine, that that which once hath beene not canonicall, can by continuaunce of time, and confirmation of men become canonicall, or that which God hath not vouched woorthy to bee his word in times past, that nowe at the last he should acknowledge the same, as though hee were nowe chaunged or had repented him of his former opinion.

Admit once this doctrine of theirs, and farewell all certaintie in religion. For men will wander from one thing to an other, as wee see in the kingdome of darkenesse and Poperie where there is no ende of deuotions deuised, and inuentions of men. So that that which was good christianitie in the dayes of Christ and of his Apostles, is nowe holden to be farre from the perfection of a godly life, vnlesse wee doe helpe it with our will-worshippings, and by the obeying the preceptes of the church. Nay, graunt them this, and then that worde written that wee haue, it shall speake nothing but Romish, so that whatsoeuer is the meaning and true sense of the scriptures, yet God must be taught to speake as the church of Rome will haue him. To this ende tendeth that common axiome receiued of them all, and vsed by Bellarmine. The true sense of the Scripture hangeth of vnwritten traditions. So that beleeue them, and they will easily confute any aduersaries. For first they alow for scripture what they will. Secondly, that which they must needes confesse to bee Scripture, must bee expounded by their vnwritten Traditions. That (I say) that is written by that

De verbo dei lib. 4. cap. 11.

which

which is vnwritten, the certaine by the vncertaine. Like to Procustes his bed, which who so lay in it, if he were too long, he was cut shorter, if he were too short, he was stretched out longer. So must all be made fit to their traditions. Seeing therefore the Canonical Bookes haue so manifest a testimonie, not onely of the godly, but euen of the aduersaries themselues, and the credite of the Apocrypha by so great authorities is suspect: I will conclude with Bellarmines words: That he is not well in his wit, that not regarding the Scripture, the surest and safest rule, will referre himself to the iudgement of the inward spirit which is often deceitfull, and alwayes vncertaine, as in truth the Papists do. For they will make you beleeue that because they are guided by the holy Ghost, they cannot erre in their traditions. This rule then of Gods written word in the Canonicall bookes of the old and new Testament, being set downe, as a rule most sure to trie all doctrines with, let vs now proceed to examine other matters in controuersy among vs, when I shal first haue answered a common obiection, wherein all the most ignorant sort especially of Papists doe marueilously trust and triumph, and doe therewith deceiue others, such as them selues are.

De verbo dei, lib. 1. cap. 2.

How shal I know the scriptures (say they) to be the scriptures, but by the authoritie of the Church? I will not answer (although I might very well) that absurdly they call that in question, whereof there is no doubt among vs. For neither we nor they denie Gods word. It is knowne of all, it is receiued of vs all. Therfore they put case of that there is not, neither is likely to be amongs vs. But for their sakes that are ignorant, I answer plainely and shortly out of Saint Augustine. Thou (Lord) hast perswaded me, that they are blame worthie, not who haue beleeued thy bookes, which thou hast so setled almost in all nations, but they that haue not beleeued them And that I should not heare them, if perchance any would say to me, How

Confess. 6. cap. 5.

knowest

knowest thou that those bookes (the scripture) are giuen to mankinde, by the spirite of one, very, and most true God? Yea, Saint Augustine there confesseth, that when he was but a nouice in religion, yet was he perswaded, that God would neuer haue made the whole world so to reuerence the Scriptures, but that he meant to be beleeued in them, and to be sought out by them. We see then by saint Augustine, that not onely that common account that the whole world (not the Church onely) maketh of the Scriptures, should be sufficient to stop our mouths for asking that question; but also that he flatly tellerh vs, that God would not haue vs to heare such faithles and fruitles obiections. But I know, they will by and by come vpon me with that place of Augustine, I would not beleeue the Gospel, vnlesse the authoritie of the Church should moue me thereto. Out of which, they will perchance conclude as grosly, as you heard Eckius hath done, That the Scripture it selfe hath no credite, but as the Church will bestow it vpon the same. But Melchior Canus a learned Papist doth gather otherwise out of that place, and doth in deed truely answere this common obiection for vs, out of the said words of S. Augustine, concluding thus. Therefore it teacheth not, that beleeuing the Gospel is grounded vpon the authoritie of the Church, but onely that there is no sure way, whereby either Infidels or Nouices in faith may come to the holy Scriptures, but the consent of the Catholike Church. Yea, he hath taught a little before in that Chapter, that although to haue faith, certaine external meanes and helpes are required, yet those moue vs nothing, without the working of Gods holy spirit. And he much misliketh of them that teach that our faith must rest vpon that point, That we beleeue that the church is true, or cannot erre. For thereupon he gathereth this absurditie, that our faith should be grounded vpon the truth, not of God but of man. He also plainly affirmeth, that if a man should aske, how the faithfull do know that God hath

Cont. epist. fundam. c. 5.

Locor. Theol. lib. 2. cap. 8.

reuealed

reuealed that which they beleeue: they cannot anſwere by the authoritie of the Church, but it is by the inward light of Gods ſpirit that they know the ſame. If now thou aſke me how I know the Scriptures to be the Scriptures, I anſwere out of Canus, not by the authority of the Church, but by the motion of Gods ſpirit, and witneſſe thereof. If thou vrge that place of Auguſtine, Canus telleth thee that they who are become Chriſtians, are not ſo brought to beleeue the Scriptures but onely Infidels, and Nouices in religion. So that this place ſerueth nothing to obiect againſt vs, who profeſſe Chriſtianitie alreadie, and beleeue the worde which the Manichies did not, of whom, and to whom Saint Auguſtine there writeth. But we had neede out of that place to admoniſh you, that in reſpect of that reuerence which with one conſent al that profeſſe Chriſtianitie doe yeeld vnto the ſcriptures, you would be aſhamed ſo to depraue and deſpiſe them, ſo to abuſe and reiect them at your owne pleaſure, as you alwayes haue done. You make vnlawfull that which God hath mad lawfull: as for example: It was lawfull in the Apoſtles time, for euerie Priеſt, Biſhop, and Deacon to haue one wife, but now by the appointment of the Pope they may not haue a wife, ſayth a friend of your owne, a bird of your owne neſt. So that not the ſcripture, or the will of God, but the worde of the Pope muſt be the rule of our life: ſo that whereas Auguſtine for the Church beleeued the ſcriptures, you for your Churches ſake controll the ſcriptures, and diſobey them. And for the eſtabliſhing of that vndue honour which they would beſtow vpon the moſt happie mother of Chriſt the virgin Mary: Marke the boldneſſe of Durand, a great

Dion. Carth. 1. Tim. 3.

Rathons. diu. li. 4. tub. 6.

piller in the Popiſh Church, who writeth thus. Although it is ſaid (in the Scriptures) that Chriſt riſing did firſt appeare to Marie Magdalen, yet it is more truly beleeued, that firſt of all he appeared to his mother. Is it not plaine, how that to eſtabliſh their fooliſh toyes, he giueth the lie to that worde that is onely true? O groſſe boldneſſe!

nesse. Seeing therefore this worde hath not only testimonie within vs which is the strongest witnesse, but also with so great consent is knowne to be Gods worde, be ashamed now to call it into question, or to put it to the triall of the Church (by which the Papists alwaies vnderstand the Romish Church) whether it shal be allowed for currant or not. For in deede this blasphemous sense (which as I haue shewed, euen their owne friends can in no wise like of) is now the common exposition of those words of S. Aug. I will not beleeue the scriptures, vnlesse the Church of Rome do allow the Bookes for Canonicall, and expound them as she shall thinke good. And thus much to answer this their common obiection.

What the Catholike Church is, that is mentioned in the Creede.

CHAP. 6

THE PROTESTANTS

VVE say with the Apostle Saint *Paul*, that the catholike church which is spoken of in the Creede, *Is the house of God, the pillar and ground of truth.* And with the fathers, that it is the companie of all the faithfull of all times, and of all places. And with Saint *Iohn*, *The Bride of the Lambe, and the bodie of Christ.* And therefore

1. Tim. 3.

Apoc. 21. 9.

THE PAPISTS

BVt the Church of Rome to get a Catholike Church, admit good and bad to be of their Church, namely reprobates, wicked, and vngodly ones. Neither do thinke that they neede any inward vertue to bee of their Church, but onely that they professe religion, and be vnder the Pope. Well may they in some sort seeme to haue a Catholike Church, because all is.

Bell. de Eccle. li. 3. cap. 2.

fish

THE PROTESTANTS

fore that the wicked and faithlesse are not of this Church, nor can be counted of this companie.

THE PAPISTS

fish that comes into their net, but holy & apostolike it shal not be, nor Catholike as in the Creed is meant.

Wherein this is worthie to be reproued in them, that whereas they crie out in worde and writing, The Catholike church of Rome, and vnlesse you beleeue the Catholike Church, you cannot be saued. And for proofe hereof they alledge this article, I beleeue the Catholike church, yet when they should tell vs what this Catholike church is, whereunto we must so necessarily be subiect, they onely paint vnto vs I know not what Romish Church, which is no more like the true Catholike church, than that church of Israel, when it was started aside from the true worship of God, was like to the true church of God that remained amongest the people of the Iewes, as by these few reasons may appeare. The catholike church is *One*, that is to say, one companie, and vnited and knit together by one spirite, and the selfe same graces, but the reprobate and vngodly (who fill vp a place in the Romish catholike church) neither are one company with the Saints, nor vnited to them by the same spirit and graces, to be partakers of the communion of Saints: Therefore that catholike and the Romish catholike Church are not all one. Secondly, that Church is *Holy*, and that not in part, but perfectly, euen without spot or wrinckle. For in our Creed we doe not speake of the church that is, but that shalbe, not that which we see with our eye, but by faith, not that which is perfected, but hoped for, which we shall not in deede behold with our eyes, vntill it come downe from heauen, as saint Iohn speaketh of the heauenly Ierusalem, which (as witnesseth saint Ambrose) doth represent the Church that shall bee after the ende of the world. Of which minde is also saint Augustine. But the Romish catholike church is of omnigatherous

The catholike church in ỳ Creed, and the Romish contrary.

One

Holy

Ephe.5.16. 27

Reuel.21

Apoc.21

Apoc.21

gatherers, as people goe to faires or markets, of all sorts and qualities. And although a man haue not one good thing in him, not one crum of honestie, hee is good enough to make vp a number in the Church of Rome, but such a church is not holy, and therefore not that that is mentioned in the Creede. Thirdly that church is catholike, that is (as all the godly haue acknoledged it) the mother of all Christians, the companie of all the saints both in heauen and vpon earth. But the Romish catholike church receiueth only them that acknowledge the bishop of Rome to be their head. If then they dare not affirme the pope to be the head of them that are in heauen, I trust they will not from henceforth charge vs to be iniurious to the church of Rome, if we affirme it not to bee the true catholike church. If they reply, that the church may bee called catholike in other respects than in that only which I haue mentioned. I graunt it. But the question amongst vs in deed is, whether the church of Rome be the true catholik church, which euen by our creed we are bound to beleeue. Which the papists affirm, & therfore would haue the world to imagine that we despise the catholike church which is mentioned in the creede, when we vpon iust causes depart from that Romish church, which hath set it selfe, these many yeares against Gods church. As for the principal arguments wherby they would proue that they say, do nothing touch the catholike church, which is the thing in question, but only the state of the church in this life, and therefore are not worthie the repeating. But among other absurdities which they are forced to grant, for to defend this their vntrue assertion, this is blasphemous, although they all defend it, That some of the members of Christes bodie shal not be saued. As though there were not vertue inough in Christ, to quicken all them that are grafted into him, whereas in truth, He that hath the sonne hath life. That is also absurd, that if the wicked and reprobate bee of the church of Christ, as they say, thē they are members of two Catholike,

bodies, for they are of the church malignant, as they must needs confesse: which is as false as that one hand may belong to two men. Lastly how absurd is it that the catholike church should acknowledge the Pope for her head? Shee is a citie or house, she can therefore haue but one foundation: shee is a fruitfull Vine, shee can haue but one roote: she is a Doue, she can haue but one mate: shee is Christs bodie, she can haue but one head: shee is the Lambs bride, she can haue but one husband. The foundation of this house, the roote of this Vine, the mate of this Doue, the head of this bodie, the husbande of this wife, is Christ. Although most impudently the Bishop of Rome, and most blasphemously, doe take vppon him to be the husbande to that wife also, or else, to take Christs wife from him. We (saith hee) being vnwilling to neglect the vpright dealing or iustice of vs, and of the Church our spouse. What greater blasphemie than this can there be? Saint Paule sayeth, I haue prepared you for one husbande, not for two, and he nameth him to be Christ, who though he bee absent, yet is he also present, absent in flesh, but present in power and spirite, and so will he bee alwayes with his, euen vnto the end of the worlde. So that the church hath no neede of that ministeriall head, that cannot bee but in one place at one time: seeing Christes spirit is his Vicar in his church, which can be in all places at once, as the church is scattered in many places through the whole world.

Eph. 1. &. 5.

C. quoniam, de Immunitate. 6.

2. Cor. 11. 2.

Math. 28. 20 Iho. 14. 16. 17. 18

Ter. precipt.

That

That the catholike Church mentioned in the Articles of our beliefe, is not visible, or to be seene.

CHAP. 7

THE PROTESTANTS

BEcause the Catholike Church mentioned in the Creed, is that heauenly *Ierusalem that is mother of vs all*, and comprehendeth (as S. *Augustine* saith) not onely that part that wandreth vpon earth, frō the rising of the Sunne, to the going downe of the same, but that also that is in heauen: And the company of Christians for the time in earth, is not the vniuersall Church, but is only a smal part therof (as *Sander* a papist cōfesseth:) It followeth that that Church which is spoken of in the Creed, is not that small flocke that wādreth here in this world: And so consequently, that that catholike Church, because the farre greatest part thereof is in heauen (and so not to be seene) cannot bee seene of vs. And for that

Gal. 4. 26

Enchir. ca. 56.

In the preface to his booke of Images.

THE PAPISTS

BVt *that whorish Romish Church, which hath nothing to commend hir, but an outward painting, that consisteth of worldly glory (wher as the glory of Christs true spouse is chiefly inward) and a shew of succession in the chaire of them that were knowne to be good men, but not in their faith and godlinesse: least that men should seeke to know the Church by the word, which is that only infallible mark that our sauior Christ giueth, and likewise Saint* Paule *to the Ephesians, and Saint* Augustine *doeth highly commend the same, so that if hee erre from the true Church, seeing Christ hath giuen him so good a marke of her, he confesseth himselfe to bee too blame for it. Least that (I say) men should occupie themselues in this word written, seeking to finde the Church*

Psal. 45. 13

Iohn 10. 3, 4 5. 27

Ephe. 2. 20

De vnitate Eccles. cent. Petil. ca. 10

THE PROTESTANTS

that cause are wee taught to say, I beleeue the holy Catholike Church, but things that are seene, are not, nay cannot be beleeued. For, *faith is the ground of things that are hoped for, and the euidence of things that are not seene.* Therefore, either must we denie I beleeue the holy Catholike Church, to be an Article of our faith, or else must it bee confessed, that the Catholike Church is inuisible.

Heb. 11. 1

THE PAPISTS

there, this seducing sinagogue doth beare vs in hand, that the true Church must be glorious to the eye, and easie to be seene, and that there is no other Catholike Church but such a one. And then they knowe, that there is not in all the worlde such a one, that maketh so faire a shewe to bee found, but onely that of Rome, which is liuely described by Saint Iohn, *in the Apocalips.* Reuel. 17.

And although this is a common principle in the Catholike Church, and in euery bodies mouth, That the Catholike church is visible, which Campion in his third reason, and Turrian against Sadeel, doe manifestly affirme. Yet I know not how it commeth to passe, that euen the greatest pillars of poperie, do not so much as define the Catholike church, and deale (as I thinke) in this question verie fearefully, as may appeare, not onely by Melchior Canus in his fourth booke, but especially by Belarmine, who appointing a whole Chapter for proofe of this point, yet dareth not, in the verie title of the Chapter, set downe that is in question, that is to say, that the catholike Church is visible, (for so they say) but onely this is the title of that chapter, that the Church is visible. Which if he meane it of particular Churches, we say also that they may be visible: If he meane it of the catholike Church, which is the thing in question, why is hee afrayed to say so? Surely euen his owne conscience tolde him, that of all the argu-

Camp. rat. 3.

Loc. Theolo. de eccle. milit. lib. 3. cap. 12.

ments

ments that he hath in that place, there is not one, out of which he may conclude, That the Catholike Church, catholike (I say) in that sense that I haue proued it to bee taken in the Creede, is, or can bee visible to vs in this world. And therefore craftily he leaueth the question, and falleth to other matters. I therefore see no cause, why I may not truely and boldly conclude, that that Heauenly Ierusalem, and bride of the Lambe, that spouse of Christ mentioned in the Apocalips, which in deed Saint Iohn sawe but by vision onely, is the same catholike church that we speake of in the Creede: but whilest wee wander here wee can not see it, but by faith onely. But when Christ our head and captaine shall haue put downe all rule, and all authoritie and power, then shall the glorie of the Church in deede appeare, then shall shee be exalted aboue the mountaines, as Saint Augustine confesseth. Yea, then shall the Church be made perfectly catholike, when no member shall be wanting vnto it. Then shall the godly, not by faith as now, but euen with their tenued eyes see her, and her beautie.

Apoc. 21, 2.

1. Cor. 15, 24.

In Apoc. Hom. 18

The Church here militant vpon the earth, may erre.

Chap. 8

The Protestants	The Papists
ALthough that part of the catholike Church which is alreadie *entred into her Masters ioy*, cannot erre, yet this part that is here vpon the earth, because	*BVt the Church of Rome would make vs beleeue their garden wil bring forth no weedes. And that the ignorant might with reuerence receyue and beleeue whatsoeuer*

Mat. 25, 21.

THE PROTESTANTS

cause it consisteth of men, who are subiect to infirmities, neither are they endued with the spirit, but in some measure, neither is it conuersant or remaining, but in the vally, not of misery only, but of ignorance also: it therfore may be subiect vnto errors for a time, although it shall neuer be quite ouercome of the same. For their errors shall be either of small importance, or short cõtinuance.

THE PAPISTS

euer they say, with great confidence they sound it euerie where, that the church of Rome cannot erre. And by the church they doe not meane all (for they will not so much esteeme of the lay people) but the Bishops, yea the Pope himselfe although hee but one man, yea, and many times a most vile and lewde man, yet they will in no wise that hee may erre, speaking iudicially in matters of fayth.

Now, for the Arguments whereby they would vphold their errour, the first sort is grounded vpon some places of Scripture, wrested and abused for their purpose, as, when the Scriptures promise the assistance of Gods spirit, to teach vs, or direct vs. And of these some are more particular than other.

Argument. Luke 22.32 Christ said to Peter, I haue prayed for thee, that thy faith should not fail, therfore Peter could not erre. And if Peter could not erre, neither his successours (as they surmise.) And yet verie soone after, the very same Apostle did not denie onely his maister, and that three times, but also began to curse and sweare that he knew him not. Shall we then say, that Christ was not so good as his promise? God forbid. Christ therefore prayed not that Peter might not erre at all, or that his faith might not any thing faint, but that it might not altogether faile. Or, to vse the wordes of Theophilact, That if the leafe of his faith did fall, yet the roote should not die. Christs prayer therefore was not that Peter should not erre, but that he should not continue

Answere. Ver. 57, 58, 60 Mat. 26. 74 Theo. Lu. 22

tinue in errour, and so it preuailed. And therefore here is no priuiledge for the church of Rome, or the Pope, that they may not erre, because wee see Peter himselfe had no such priuiledge. Neither was this prayer of Christs, for Peter onely, as is most plaine by the Euangelist saint Iohn, I pray not for them onely, but for all that through them shall beleeue in my name. It was therefore for all the Apostles, yea for all the beleeuers. Although Christ spake there particularly to Peter, (as Theophilact sayth) perchaunce, because he was bolder than the rest, and proude because of that was said vnto him. And by this that hath beene said, appeareth the answere to the other places of the scripture that seeme more generall. Iohn 17.20 In Luke 22

When Christ promiseth to giue vs his spirit to teach vs, and direct vs, they inferre, therefore the church cannot erre. Argument

Wherein they commit two absurdities. First, in robbing a great number of Gods people of that comfort that belongeth vnto them, in that they make the promises, which generally belong to all the faithfull, to be spoken but to some few, (for, by the church they vnderstand either the pope, or the bishops.) Secondly, that they beare ỹ world in hand, that Christ prayed for that which he did not, or that he promiseth vs that which he neuer meant, or that he spake of such perfection, as it is vnpossible men should attaine vnto. Yea, Theophilact in my iudgement most notablie sheweth, that when Christ had promised to send the holy Ghost which should lead into al truth, least any body should thereby imagin that the holy Ghost is greater than Christ, if it can make vs partakers of greater and mo things than Christ can, he addeth, Hee shall not speake of himselfe, that is, he shall speake nothing of his owne, but that is mine. For he that sayth (he shall speake) whatsoeuer he hath hard, doth signifie, that he shal teach nothing but that which Christ hath taught. And these are the verie wordes of Theophilact, whereby he doth not onely say, that the Answere In Iohn 16

holy Ghost can adde nothing of his owne to that which Christ hath taught, and so may not bring into the church any new doctrines, as the church of Rome doth vnder this colour, but also, that it is a diminishing of Christs glorie, and a preferring of the holy Ghost before Christ, to suppose that the holy Ghost can or may teach any thing in Gods church that hath not bin taught by Christ himselfe. Wherin he mightily beateth downe that proude bragge of the church of Rome, wherby they seeke to exempt themselues from all errour, because they falsely chalenge vnto themselues, that their doctrines and traditions are vnwritten verities, and to be beleeued as well as Gods worde, as comming from this spirit, whereas they are nothing consonant to that which Christ taught, and therefore the spirite had no commission to teach the same. Yea in vaine they say they are directed by Gods spirite, when as they teach that that Gods spirit neither can nor will teach, because Christ hath not taught it before. Neither doe we derogate anie thing herein from the power of the spirit, whose direction if we could follow, we should neuer do amisse: but impute it to our owne weaknes, & ignorance, & corruption, whereby it commeth to passe, that euen the godly many times grieue Gods spirit, and suffer him not to haue his perfect worke. Other arguments also they haue, but they haue scarce any shew of truth, and therefore I thinke them not worthie answering: for their places out of the fathers doe commend the faith of Rome that then was, and their constancie in the same, but what is that to this degenerate church of Rome that now is: of the church whereof we may say as one saith of their citie, that a man will seeke Rome in the midst of Rome: So a man will seeke the church euen in the midst of their most shewe of religion, and yet not finde it.

Of

Of the markes of the Church, or how wee may know the true Church.

Chap. 9.

The Protestants

WE must iudge of the tree of the church, by the fruits that she bringeth foorth, that is, by the faith or religion that shee teacheth, the confession or profession of the same that she maketh, the exercise of the same that she vseth, but we cānot iudge truely of these her fruits, but only by the scriptures as in the fiue first chapters hath beene shewed: therfore the true and infallible tokens or markes of the true church, are to be had out of the word of God, or the Scriptures.

The Papists

NOwe the Papistes will haue their church to bee the true church, becauſe ſhee hath (by vniuſt claime) a good name to bee called Catholike, becauſe ſhee is ancient, and hath laſted long. She is great, and hath alwayes borne fruit, ſuch as it was: for theſe are the firſt fiue notes reckoned vp by Bellarmine, and indeede their chiefeſt, which eſpecially they reſt vppon. And may not an euill tree haue all theſe properties? Yes verely. And as for the reſt of his marks, in the iudgement of an indifferent Reader, they will neuer be accounted true markes of the Church, excepting thoſe notes wherein he ſeemeth to conſent with vs, to try the church by the word, namely, by holineſſe of doctrine.

Name catholike. Antiquity. Continuance. Greatneſſe. Succeſſion

Lib. 4. de notis eccleſ.

Becauſe I haue in another treatiſe ſhewed (I truſt) ſufficiently, that thoſe markes of the church which they make greateſt account of, neither are any true markes, and that we may make as good claime to them as they can: it ſhall

now

now be sufficient briefly to passe ouer this point, and with one or two arguments to answer this question.

The scripture the true note of the true church.

Those markes of the church, whereby wee may truely know the church, and not be deceiued, those I say onely are the true markes of the church:

But the scriptures onely are such: Therefore they onely are the infallible markes.

The *maior* or first proposition no man will deny. And that the Scriptures are such may appeare by infinite testimonies. Saint Augustine saith, it can not deceiue, nor be deceiued. And against the Donatists *de bapt. lib. 2. cap. 6.* calleth the Scriptures, the holy wey-scales or ballances. And in his booke *de bono viduitatis*, he saith, that the holy scripture doth set him his rule how to teach. And to be short, writing vpon saint Iohns Epistle he saith, that Against deceitfull errours, God would set a strength or stay in the scriptures. And Chrysostome saith vpon Genesis, that the Scripture wil not suffer him to erre or go astray, that heareth it. And therefore Gregory Nazianzene sometimes calleth the Scriptures, The Kings high way. And our sauior Christ, although he foretold the danger of error a litle before he suffered, yet doeth hee not giue the Disciples any such markes whereby they should know the true Christ or true church, as the Papistes speake of, but he earnestly commendeth his word vnto them, Ioh. 14. 15,23. & 15.7. And feruently prayeth vnto his father to sanctifie them with his trueth, namely, with his word: for he knew that to be the way to keepe them from errour. By all which it appeareth, that the scriptures onely are accounted that perfect rule, not only by the iudgement of the fathers, but also by the practise of our sauiour Christ. But most plainly S. Chrysost. saith, That the true Church can be knowen only by the Scriptures. I know that Bellarmine answereth this place in his 4. booke *de verbo Dei, ca.* 11. after two sorts. First, that the booke sauoureth somwhat of Arianisme. But in these words, what Arianisme

De pec. merit. & remiss. lib. 1. cap. 22.

Cap. 1.

In Ioh. epist. tractatu 2.

Hom. 12. in Genes.

Matth. 24.

Ioh. 17. 3, 17

Opere imperf. hom. 49

can

can Bellarmine finde. Yea Bellarmine himselfe doth in other places alleage this booke. But his second answer I confesse is very forcible. For he telleth vs, that in a booke printed of late that place is left out. Haue they not (thinke you) answered the place strongly, when they haue thrust it quite out of the booke? If they had vsed Chrysostome onely in this, sort yet were it too bad dealing, but it may appeare by Franciscus Iunius his preface before the booke called *Index Expurgatorius*, that they haue left few of the Fathers vncorrupted. I would to God therefore that this and such other gelding and falsifying of the fathers, by that deceiuing church of Rome, which seekes to make them al say as she doth, could stir vp the christiã princes that professe religion in a godly care, to prouide for the safetie and maintenaunce of religion, and the trueth thereof in time to come. Which in my iudgement can not well be performed, except that, to preuent the credite of those falsified copies, which within short time are almost onely like to remaine, because the ancient, which are the truest, wil be worne out, the godly Princes by common consent woulde take some speedy order for printing of al the fathers, according to the ancientest and most pure copies that might be found. The second argument is this. Whatsoeuer notes do not teach it to be euidently true, that the church whereof they are the notes, is the true church of God, may deceiue, and therefore are not certaine notes of the true church: But such are the notes that the Papists would haue vs to beleeue, therefore they are but deceitfull notes. The *maior* or first proposition is most true, and may well bee prooued out of that axiome or rule that Bellarmine setteth downe, saying, That the rule of the catholike faith must bee sure or certaine. The *minor* or second proposition, is Bellarmines owne confession, euen in the selfe same words that I haue set downe. Therefore it followeth necessarily, that we must not trust the notes of the catholike church set downe by them.

De verbo dei, lib. 1. cap. 2.

De notis eccles. li 3. ca. 3.

CHAP.

CHAP. 10.

Before I beginne to set downe the difference in doctrine betweene the church of Rome and vs, concerning those Sacraments which we acknowledge to be instituted for Sacraments by God, which is indeede my especiall purpose, that in few wordes the Reader may take a view, both of the one and the other, I haue thought good, very briefly, to note vnto you two or three points, wherein in the generall doctrine of the Sacraments, we iustly dissent from them, because they do dissent from the word of truth. Wherein, my purpose is not to enter into the darke and daungerous subtilties of the Schoolemen, who herein agree not among themselues: but onely to point vnto the plaine trueth, and the falshoode contrary to the same.

VVhat a Sacrament is, what is the *effect of it, or what it worketh,* how many Sacraments there are.

THE PROTESTANTS

VVhat a Sacrament is

A Sacrament is an externall signe instituted & appointed of God, to bee vsed in his Church, by the receiuing whereof euerie faithfull man and woman, is assured of eternall graces. I knowe that this word Sacrament may

THE PAPISTS

BVT the Papistes doe define a Sacrament to bee, A thing subiect to the senses, which by Gods institution, hath power both to signifie, and to woorke, Holinesse and Righteousnesse. *So that by this it is easie to vnderstād what*

Concil. Trid. Catechis.

THE PROTESTANTS

may be taken more largely, and is ſometimes, eſpecially by ſaint *Auguſtine*, and after his time, but this is the true definition of a Sacrament in that ſence that we vſe it, for the two Sacraments vſed by vs in our churches. And though we call it a ſigne, yet wee ſay withall, that it is a very effectual, and (as I may ſo call it) a powerfull ſigne, to ſtrengthen and increaſe our faith, & make vs take more ſure hold of the promiſes, the perfourmance whereof the Sacraments do (as it were) ſeale vp in our hearts: neither doeth the ſacrament worke this, or hath this effect, in reſpect of any vertue that is included in theſe viſible ſignes, but becauſe God hath appointed them to be the ſeales of his promiſes, as the Apoſtle witneſſeth of circumciſion, & *Tertull.* of Baptiſme. For as the ſeale beeing ſet to the writing, doth aſſure him to whom the writing is made, of the perfourmance of ſuch couenants

A powerfull ſigne to increaſe or ſtrengthen faith.

De Pœniten. Rom. 4. 11

THE PAPISTS

what vertue and efficacie they will giue to the Sacraments. Yea, it is by Bellarmine *plainely confeſſed, that they teach a Sacrament to haue that ſtrength of it ſelfe, that it can ſanctifie and iuſtifie. And that wee may the better vnderſtand what they meane hereby, with one conſent they teach, and* Bellarmine *by name, that the Sacraments doe woorke theſe things without either faith, or any inward motion. So that their meaning is, that the very worke it ſelfe of receiuing the Sacrament, euen by vertue of that ſacramentall action, doth giue to the receiuer grace. How blaſphemous this doctrine is, may appeare, firſt, becauſe they doe manifeſt wrong to the ſpirit of ſanctification, in aſcribing vnto theſe viſible and externall creatures, whereof the Sacraments doe conſiſt, that which only gods ſpirit can worke in vs, by putting into our hearts, the feare of God, and vniting his lawe in the ſame, and purifying our hearts by faith. And therefore is this ſpirit called*

De Sacram. lib. 2. cap. 2.

De Sacram. lib. 2. cap. 1.

Bellarm. de Sacram. lib. 2. cap. 2.

Ierem. 32. 40.

Ierem. 31. 33. Ezec. 36. 25. Dan. 15. 9.

THE PROTESTANTS

as therein are contained, and yet not becauſe of the print in the waxe, but becauſe it is known to be his ſeale who hath made the couenants with him: euen ſo the Sacraments do ſerue to confirme and increaſe faith in the faithfull, not becauſe there is any ſuch power in thoſe viſible creatures, which are the externall thing in the ſame, but becauſe we are aſſuredly perſwaded, that God hath appointed them to that end. And as the Sacraments doe thus ſerue to ſtrengthen and increaſe our faith, ſo thereby alſo doe we make profeſsion of this our faith, and in token that we haue this perſwaſion ſetled in our heart, wee come to receiue ſuch Sacraments, as God hath appointed to teſtifie betweene him and vs, of his graces towardes vs. And for this cauſe, when the Eunuch deſired to bee baptized, *Phillip* anſwered, *If thou beleeue with all thy heart, thou mayeſt*. Nay, the Sacraments

Profeſſion of our faith.

Act.8.36,37

THE PAPISTS

called Holy, or the ſpirite of ſanctification, becauſe it onely can make holy. Secondly, to giue vnto the Sacraments power by the vertue thereof *to iuſtifie, is iniurious vnto the bloud of Chriſt, which precious ranſome is able onely to take away ſinnes, and to make vs appeare iuſt and righteous before God. Then alſo this doctrine is abſurd, as may be prooued in a word or two. If it be true that the Papiſts teach, then did not our Sauiour Chriſt teach vs the true vſe of the Sacrament, when he ſaid,* Doe this in remembrance of me, *for hee ſhoulde rather haue ſaid, Doe this to ſanctifie and ſaue your ſelues. But to thinke that Chriſt taught vs not the true benefite of the Sacrament, is too groſſe wickedneſſe: Therefore is it verie abſurde, to aſcribe that vertue to the Sacrament or outward ſigne. Secondly, if the Sacrament doe giue grace (as they ſay) or, if it do ſanctifie or iuſtifie of it ſelfe: then the infantes that die before they can ſinne actually, becauſe they*

THE PROTESTANTS.

ments are but vnprofitable to them, which without faith doe receiue the same, but *hee that beleeueth and is baptized, shalbe saued.* We therfore do not teach the Sacramentes to be but bare signes (as some would make the simple to beleeue, but that they are such signes as God hath made to worke effectually by the power of his Spirite, in the hearts of the faythfull, to assure them of Gods good graces. Nowe of such Sacraments as in the beginning I haue defined, wee haue but two, that is to say, Baptisme, wherein we are entred into Christs family, and the Supper of the Lorde, wherein we are nourished in the same. For although the people of Israel had many representations of Gods fauour towardes them, to assure the faithful of sanctification and iustification, yet Circumcision was commaunded without exception, to all the males (in whō also the women were consecra-

Mar.16.16.

How many Sacraments there be.

Gen.17.10

THE PAPISTS.

they are baptized, must needs be saued, although they bee not of that number which God hath chosen vnto himselfe before the foundations of the worlde were laide. Which to affirme is nothing else, but to tie our saluation, not to Gods grace in electing in Christ whome hee would, but to such externall meanes, as haue alwayes beene accounted but helpers to our faith, as the Apostle teacheth by the example of Circumcision in Abraham, *but no workers of saluation. And to be short, how agreeth this that they say, that the Sacrament hath strength or force to worke* Holinesse or Righteousnesse, *with that which they also say,* That infants when they are baptized, haue not any new motions or inclinations like vnto the actions of faith and loue. *If the Sacraments worke not in them such effectes, who haue not anie actual sinne to let or hinder, how shal we think they work in others that are strōgly assaulted with the lusts of sin?*

Ephes.1.

Ro.4.10,11.

De Sacram. Bapt. lib.1. cap.11

There-

THE PROTESTANTS

consecrated to the Lord) and the eating of the paschall Lamb, belonged to al the congregation of the
Exod. 12. 47. children of Israel, whereas their other ceremonies were for the most, performed by the Priest. And in like maner although wee may haue sundrie visible signes of inuisible grace, yet such sacraments as the sacrament of Baptisme, & the Supper of the Lorde, neither the scriptures, nor the fathers for 400. yeares after Christ did acknowlege any other than those two. For as for Saint *Augustine*, he taketh the word Sacrament so largely that hee accounteth for Sacraments many thinges that are not by the Papists themselues accounted Sacraments.

THE PAPISTS

Therefore let vs not ascribe such working vnto them, but vnto Christ, who is made vnto vs righteousnesse and 1. Cor. 1. 30
holinesse. *As for the number of seuen Sacraments, two of them wee acknowledge, with the Fathers of the Primitiue church, Baptisme and the Lordes Supper. As for the other fiue, either they haue no commaundement in the word, or no visibl signes, or, to be short, no warrant in the word, or Primitiue church, to bee such Sacraments as the other two are. Although wee deny not but the things haue had, and many of them yet haue their godly vse in Gods Church.*

Of the Sacrament of Baptisme.

CHAP. II.

THE PROTESTANTS

WE acknowlege Baptism to be, as it were a Gods-peny, and earnest of

THE PAPISTS

BVt the Church of Rome, lest we should (constantly beleeuing the promises, and vsing

THE PROTESTANTS.

of our entrance into Christes family. Wherein wee are both fully assured, that (by the blood of Christ, which is figured by that water) our sinnes are so washed away, that they shall not bee imputed vnto vs: and also the promise of that spirite of regeneration whereby wee growe to be new men, is sealed vp in our hearts, so that therein the faithfull are ingraffed into Christ, to be made partakers of al his treasures, and namely, that hee may bee vnto vs
1. Cor. 1. 30. *sanctification and redemption.* And as therin our faith is thus norished, so is it also a publike testification and witnessing of our profession, so that wee doe not only beleeue with our heart vnto righteousnesse, but also shew that wee are not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, & for that cause wee weare that badge of our profession, and cognisance of our religion.

THE PAPISTS.

vsing the Sacraments according to Christs institution) take sure hold of Iesus christ, and to acknowledge our salvation to bee by him onely, in whome the word and Sacraments send vs to seeke it: teacheth vs, that the very Sacrament of it selfe hath such force and vertue, as that it doth extinguish and Andrad. Orthod. Explic. lib. 3. *quite abolish, not onely the daunger and condemnation (the rewarde due to sinne,) but also the verie corruption of the same. And on the contrarie, that the verie infants that die before they bee baptised, haue their place of torment appointed vnto* Bellarmine de purgat. lib. 2. cap. 6 *them, where they must bee purged. So that as they giue the power of killing sinne in vs vnto the Sacrament, which onely belongeth vnto Christ; so in this latter point* Rom. 6. *they doe in a manner make Christ scant able for to saue without the sacrament, and teach sinne by other meanes than by Christ only to be purged.*

Now, the first reason whereby Bellarmine will proove,
De sacr. baptism. li. 1. ca. 4 that the Sacrament of it selfe hath such force, as that it

doth worke in vs holinesse, and abolish sinne, and therefore, that without it no man or woman can be saued, is that
Ioh 3.5 place of saint Iohn, Vnlesse a man be borne againe of Water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdome of God. And for the better credite of his assertion,
De peccatorum merit. & remiss. lib. 1. cap. 30. he telleth vs, that saint Augustine in his first booke of the merites of sinnes, and the forgiuenesse thereof, the thirtieth chapter, doth shew, that these wordes are not a commandement, but declare the means of saluation: as though saint Augustine would make the Sacrament as necessary to saluation, as meate for our life, or physicke for recouery of health, for these are the examples alledged afterwardes by Bellarmine. But he belieth that learned father, for hee hath not any such thing in that place, although indeede hee handle that place of scripture largely there.

But first before I enter any further into the consideration of this point, lest I should bee mistaken, as though I accounted the Sacrament of no necessitie, I affirme it to bee so necessarie, that if it may bee had according vnto Christes institution, and any man or woman shall wilfully refuse the same, by this their contempt they doe wilfully cut off themselues from the body of Christ, and so make themselues vncapable of such graces as God in Christ bestoweth vpon his. But if otherwise any man, woman, or childe, being desirous to enter into the felowship of the holy couenant, and to be incorporated by that Sacrament into the presence of Christ, shall die or depart out of this life, before they can attaine thereto: God forbid that we should thinke either so vncharitably of them, as to iudge them vnworthy of Gods mercy: or so hardly of God, as that hee would alter his eternall councell, for want of this external sacrament: or so slenderly of the vertue of Christ his blood, as that without this water it can not wash vs from sinne. No doubt many died in the wildernesse, before the Israelites came to the land of promise, that had not the sacramẽt of circumcision, and also afterwards, by all likelihoode, in

Babylon.

Babylon. The thiefe vpon the crosse, of whose saluation we make no doubt, was not baptised. Yea, the order that God vseth in saving vs, doeth teach vs, that without the Sacraments we may be saued, because that election or predestination goeth before calling, whether it be internall by the spirit, or externall by the word and Sacraments. Therefore wee must either imagine Gods election not to be certaine, which is blasphemous, or else, that all that are elect are saued, although they haue not opportunity to receiue that externall seale of Gods couenant. Therefore I say, that Baptisme is very necessary, and in any wise to be vsed and receiued of them, that may according to Christes institution haue the same. But we detest that doctrine of the Papists, that teacheth it to be so necessary, that whosoeuer is not baptized, can not be saued: whereupon they permit lay men, yea women to baptise, whereas the virgin Mary might not baptize, as Epiphanius noteth, *haeres. 97.* and so prophane that holy sacrament in altering Christes institution. But rather we say with Tertullian *de penitentia*, Wee are not washed, that wee may cease to sinne, but because we haue ceased to sinne, seeing in heart wee are washed. Which words, because Bellarmine *lib. 2 de effect. sacrament. cap. 10.* can not answere, he full wisely maketh as if hee neuer sawe them, and saieth nothing vnto them.

Rom. 8. 30
Ephes. 1. 4

And nowe to returne to the Obiection. Howsoeuer saint Augustine esteemeth of the necessitie of Baptisme, he teacheth with vs the true vse of Baptisme, against the Papists, euen in the booke alleaged by Bellarmine, speaking of the infants hee saieth thus: They stand in neede of those benefites of the Mediatour, That they beeing offered by the Sacrament and charitie of the faithfull, and so beeing incorporate into the body of Christ which is the Church, may be reconciled vnto God: that they may bee made in him liuing, safe, deliuered, redeemed, and lightened. Marke that Saint Augustine

lib. 1, ca. 26.

most plainly ascribeth vnto the sacrament, to offer and incorporate vs into the church, but to God (not to the sacrament) to quicken, saue, deliuer redeeme, and lighten vs. And seeing we see, that S. Augustine in the place alleged by Bellarmine, maketh nothing for him, but in the same booke in an other place maketh much against him: let vs see what other of the ancient Fathers doe gather out of that place of saint Iohn, whether they reason out of it as Bellarmine doeth. Chrysostome out of this place sheweth, that in that water spoken of there is represented vnto vs our Buriall, Mortification, Resurrection, life, and addeth: As it is an easie thing for vs to bee dipped in, and being pulled out to breathe againe, euen so is it for God to burne our old man, & to put on vs the new man. And hereby thou mayest vnderstand, that the vertue of the Father, the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost fulfilleth all these things. What can be more plaine than these words of Chrysostom, to teach vs, that this working vertue is ascribed vnto God, and nothing at all to the Sacrament, as the Papists teach vs. And yet Theophilact is more plaine, Euen as in this bodily seede Gods grace worketh all: euen so in Baptisme the Water is but an vnderling, and it is the Spirite that worketh all. So that I cannot see how this ancient Father, if he had directly spoken against this popish doctrine, whereby they ascribe so much vertue vnto the Sacrament, could haue vsed (if hee had liued in our time) more effectuall words to reproue the same. If then wee graunt that that place speaketh of Baptisme, as many of the Fathers haue thought, yet that which the Papistes inferre thereupon followeth not, for wee see, the working of grace is onely attributed to the spirite of God, contrary to that they doe teach. For they will needes haue vs to beleeue, that the Sacrament it selfe by receiuing of it, giueth grace. But good reasons may be yeelded, why by water in that place, the water of Baptisme can not be meant. First, because our

Homil. 24 in Ioh.

Theophilact. in Ioh. 3.

Bellarm de Sacrament. lib. 2, cap. 3

sur sauiour Christ spake there to Nicodemus, who knew nothing of the principles of religion, and therefore Christ teacheth him, that we haue not in our selues any thing to worke our saluation, but wee must be borne anew. It is vnlikely that our sauiour Christ would instruct him of the necessitie of baptisme, who as yet neuer knewe the promises, which in baptisme are sealed vp vnto vs. Secondly, Christ going about afterwardes to explane his meaning, in the next verse maketh mention of the spirite onely, and not of the water, whereas if he had spoken of baptisme, and had made it of such absolute necessitie, that in no case a man might be saued without it, hee would not haue left it out in that place, especially where hee sheweth how we are borne anew. Thirdly, that which is done in the sacramentall water, may very well be perceiued both of them that feele it, and of them that see it, or heare it: but this new birth that is spoken of in that place, how it is wrought a man can not perceiue, as our sauiour Christ telleth vs: Therefore by likelihoode, not the water of baptisme is there spoken of, but that water which God promiseth by his Prophet Ezechiel, and is called, the cleane water, because of that notable cleansing and holinesse, which no materiall water, be it neuer so excellent can worke, but onely Gods cleansing spirit, that is, The cleane water there spoken of. And this is the onely argument out of the scriptures which Bellarmine hath for the necessitie of Baptisme. But in his second booke, where he speaketh of the sacraments in generally what force they haue, hee alleageth some moe, as that of saint Iohn the Baptist.

Verse 6.

Verse 8.

Ezec. 36. 24.

Lib. 2. cap. de Sacram.

Hee (speaking of Christ) baptizeth with the holie Ghost, and with fire. His reason is sufficiently answered, by gathering it into an argument. Christ baptizeth with the holy Ghost: therefore baptisme of it selfe giueth grace. For the question among vs is, what vertue is in the Sacrament it selfe: and he telleth vs what Christ can

Matth. 3. 11

do in it. As if he should say, Christ, when hee healed him that was borne blind, made clay of spittle, and bade him
Ioh. 9 go wash in Siloam, therefore the clay put vpon the eies, and the water of Siloam, by their vertue made him to see.

Mar. 16. 16 Againe, He that beleeueth, and is baptized, shal be saued. By this wee may as well conclude, that faith saueth, (which in any wise the papists like not of) as that baptisme saueth, for it is said of both indifferently. But let vs marke his argument againe, that we may see how hee prooueth his assertion. Hee that is baptized, shall be saued, therefore the sacrament of baptisme hath of it selfe that vertue to saue. For this is it that hee must prooue. But see how weakely hee performeth it. First, whereas Christ promiseth saluation to them that beleeue, and are baptized, Bellarmine maweth these words, to declare how this saluation is wrought in vs: which is not here handled. Secondly, Christ speaketh here of beleeuing or faith, which directeth vs vnto him, in whome our saluation that is promised in the word, apprehended by faith, and sealed vp in the sacraments, is performed and perfected, that is, Christ Iesus. And how doth this proove the vertue of the sacrament in it selfe? The like is to be saide of that place
Acts 2. 38 that he bringeth out of the Actes, Amend your liues, and bee baptized euery one of you, in the name of Iesus Christ, for the remission of sinnes. As for his last place out of the scriptures, which is out of Peter, marke (I pray you) how he seeketh to hide the trueth: saint Peter saith,
1 Pet. 3. 21. Baptisme saueth vs by the resurrection of Christ. which maketh nothing against vs. But Bellarmine to make his argument seeme stronger, alleadgeth onely the former wordes, Baptisme saueth vs, as though it did so by it owne vertue: and neuer maketh mention of the latter wordes, Through the resurrection of Christ, for that is against him, and sheweth from whence baptisme hath her vertue and efficacie. And this being well considered, it wil

perchance

perchance not be hard to answere vnto much of that which they can say for this their dangerous doctrine, That the Sacrament of it selfe, euen by the very receiuing of it, giueth grace to the receiuer. And for the necessitie thereof, I haue saide before in this chapter, in the answere to the first reason, so much as (I trust) may satisfie the godly Reader.

Of Confirmation.

CHAP. 12.

THE PROTESTANTS

BVt as for Cōfirmation, as it was vsed in the Romish church, although we haue iust cause to reiect it, and much lesse can we account it a Sacramēt, which hath neither commandement in the worde, nor promise of spirituall graces: yet wee doe not deny but that the people of God, in respect of their manifold wāts, haue great neede continually to haue their ignorance instructed, their dulnesse refourmed, their weaknesse strengthned, their godly indeuors bettered, and their knowledge increased. And for this cause is it very needefull,

THE PAPISTS

BVT in steede hereof the church of Rome commendeth vnto vs a kinde of Confirmation that consisteth of a number of foolish and vnprofitable ceremonies. And to make it more readily and reuerētly to be receiued, they would perswade the ignorant, that it is a Sacrament. And not content therewith, this deuise of theirs they doe highly commend, as that It is more excellent than Baptisme it selfe, in respect of the effect of grace, bicause therein is giuen the fulnes of the spirit: (*marke their blasphemy, for the fulnesse thereof is giuen to Christ only, to al vs by measure.*) *And that*

Bellarm. de sa. li. 2. ca. 28

Coloss. 1. 19
Ioh. 3. 34
Rom. 12. 3.

THE PROTESTANTS

ful, that the childrē, which becauſe they are infantes when they are baptized, can not at their baptiſme yeelde account of their faith, ſhoulde bee taught when they are older, the principles of religion, and make before the Biſhop and others preſent, profeſsion of their faith, and that by godly exhortation they ſhould be moued openly to continue conſtantly in that holy profeſsion, & God ſhould be prayed vnto, to continue and encreaſe his good graces in them. And this holie Confirmation, I doubt not, would doe much good in the Church, if it were often vſed.

THE PAPISTS

that it doth conſummate and perfect Baptiſme, and giueth greater grace than Baptiſme doth. *What copper, or counterfeit coine dare not theſe men commend vnto vs for good gold, who dare ſo confidently to preferre the greaſie deuiſe of man, before the holy inſtitution of Chriſt himſelf? And make more account of that which themſelues doe confeſſe to haue no warrant in Gods worde, than of Chriſtes holy Sacrament.*

Bellarm. li. 2. de Confir. cap. 11.

De Sacram. confir. li. 2. cap. 2.

But let vs conſider how Bellarmine defendeth this, who for his learning is much accounted of, and that worthily, amongſt the papiſts, ſo that his want of proofe doth plainely ſhew the weakeneſſe of his cauſe. Whereas there are but three things neceſſarily required in a Sacrament, as hee truely confeſſeth, viſible ſigne, promiſe of grace, and Gods commaundement, (which much weakeneth that which hee ſaide of the working power of the Sacraments, as appeareth in the tenth chapter) he wil proue, that confirmation hath all theſe three. Hee proueth firſt, that this Sacrament (as hee termeth it) hath promiſe of grace: and why? Becauſe the holy Spirite is promiſed.

As

Is not this clarkely handled, and strongly proued? God promiseth the holy Ghost: therefore confirmation hath the promise of grace. Secondly, the visible signe is (saieth hee) the laying on of the hands vpon the head. But the popish confirmation hath not laying on of hands, neither is it necessarie now a dayes, by their owne confession. For these are the ceremonies that doe belong to that their Sacrament. First, the Oyle must be consecrated by prayer, secondly, by crossing: for without a crosse (saith Bellarmine) nothing can be consecrated. Wherein Bellarmine giueth Saint Paule the lie, because hee neuer spake of the crosse, when he said, Euerie creature of God is sanctified by the worde of God, and praier: and Bellarmine saith, nothing is sanctified without the crosse. But perchaunce he will say that oile is none of gods creatures, as indeed, in respect of the vse, or rather abuse of it, it is not. Thirdly, the Bishop must breathe vpon the cruet or cup of oyle. Fourthly, he must say to the oyle, All haile holy oyle. O foolish blasphemie. Then are there other ceremonies, but not essentiall in this Sacrament the Godfather, Certaine praiers, thirdly the Pax, then a blow vpon the cheeke, fiftly, A ragge tied about the forehead, sixtly, He must not wash his forehead, for seuen dayes. Thinke you this flouenly Sacrament hath any such grace as they would haue vs to beleeue that it hath, when as they feare that washing where the oyle was, may hinder the vertue of it? seuenthly, it must be at Easter and Whitsuntide vsed; lastly, they that receiue this Sacrament, must be fasting. But of the laying on of hands there is no mention, vnlesse you will say, that he that giueth him a blow vpon the eare, layeth his hands vpon his head. And as for that it is reckoned among the ceremonies that are not of the substance of this sacrament. But Bellarmine in another place saith, that then is that ceremony of laying on of the hands performed, when the Bishop maketh the crosse in the forehead. But that is not so: for the laying on of hands was done vpon the

Belarm. de confir. li. 2. cap. 13

1. Tim. 4. 4. 5

De effec. Sacram. lib. 3. cap. 24.

head, and was borowed from the olde lawe, of that which they did vnto the sacrifices when they brought them to bee offered, they did by that ceremonie of laying their hands vpon the head of the sacrifice, consecrate (as it were) the same to the Lord. And when God commaunded Moses to consecrate Iosue to succeed him, and to comfort and incourage him to the worke that he had to doe, he doth lay his handes vpon his head. According to which example Christ laid his hands vpon the children, & the Apostles vpon the deacons, and others, Acts 8.17. and the Elders, and Paule vpon Timothie. Now marke howe it is prooued that Popish Confirmation hath the outwarde signe of a Sacrament. The Bishop doth crosse the partie to be confirmed, in the forehead, therefore he layeth hands vpon his head. Well then, this their sacrament hath no promise (as I haue shewed) neither hath it any visible signe that was vsed and appointed by Christ and the Apostles. Nowe what commaundement hath it, which is the thirde thing that is set downe by Bellarmine, without which a Sacrament cannot be? Bellarmine flatly confesseth that it hath no expresse commaundement in the scripture, but in stead of a commaundement, he deliuereth vs the execution or practise of it, for so himselfe saieth. Why then I may thus reason: A sacrament must haue a promise of grace, a visible or sensible signe, and a commaundement from God, or else it cannot be a sacrament, as Bellarmine confesseth: but confirmation hath neither promise of grace, nor visible signe, nor commaundement from God: therefore it is no sacrament. Their argunments out of the fathers make a greater shew. It is well yet that they cannot presse vs but with the authoritie of men. Notwithstanding, this may be briefly said for their authorities from the fathers, that either they are such as haue no writings extant, but onely such scraps as they for their owne purpose haue gathered togither, and therefore are witnesses of vs worthily suspected: or, such as haue no sound credite of any indifferent man: or lastly, such as

Num. 27,24

Mat. 19,16
Acts 6.6
1. Tim. 4. 14
2. Tim. 1. 6

De effect. sacram. lib. 2. cap. 24.

Lib. 2. cap. 2 de sacram. confirm.

as make nothing for them or against vs in this question. For the Papists will haue their Confirmation to bee a sacrament, the matter whereof must bee Oyle and Balme: but neither doe the most learned fathers make mention of the Balme, neither are the Schoole-men agreed amongest themselues, that it is needful for this sacrament, as Bellarmine confesseth. Yea, they thinke it absurde, that a sacrament should be appointed by our sauiour Christ, the matter whereof should bee so rare to finde, so vncertaine whether we haue the true thing or not, and so costly, as hardly it can bee gotten, and it is doubted of some whether there be nowe any true Baulme or not. And this their sacrament is built vpon so vncertaine foundations, that Alexander Alensis, and Bonauenture, two olde pillars of Poperie, cannot find that it was instituted before the counsell at Melda. Out of all which it is easie to vnderstande, that as this Confirmation hath not in Gods worde any shew of warrant to make it a sacrament: so neither out of the fathers can anie certaine argument be gathered for the same. But such are all heretikes, and such as imagine they can find out somwhat beside the truth, following those things that are spoken diuersly and in sundrie sorts, and walking weakly, not being alwayes of one minde, are led about like blind men, by blinde guides, they shall and that worthily, fall into the hidden pit of ignorance, euer seeking the truth, but neuer finding it. Which iudgement of God here mentioned against the heretikes, we see to be fallen vpon the Papists, who had rather

wander in such vncertaine and blinde wayes,

than be ruled by the infallible

word of God.

Lib. 2. de sacram. Confirm. cap. 9

Iren. lib. 5

Of

Of the Lordes Supper, or Sacrament of the bodie and bloud of our Sauiour Christ, and namely of Transubstantiation.

CHAP. 13

THE PROTESTANTS

WE teach, that by those visible signs of bread and wine, the bodie and blood of our sauior Christ is so liuely, and effectually represented and offered vnto our faith, that the faithfull receiuers, in the same Supper, doe as truly receyue by faith Christ himselfe, with all his treasures and graces: to the comfort and foode of their soules, as they receiue the bread and wine with their mouth to the nourishment of their bodies. And that this our spirituall nourishment maye bee the more liuely represented, the substance of the bread & wine must needs remaine for our bodilie nourishment, as in Baptisme likewise the water remaineth vnchanged, to signifie

THE PAPISTS

BVt the Church of Rome, not content with this spirituall and true receiuing of Christ, do teach, that by the wordes of consecration (as they cal them) the very bread and wine haue their substance chaunged into the bodie and bloud of Christ. So that Christ, whome in the Creed we confesse to be ascended into heauen, and that he shall come from heauen to iudge the quick and the dead, is by that means brought into euery Pix: which ouerthroweth the nature of man, which hee tooke of the Virgin Marie, for man can bee but in one place. Wherby also there follow such inconueniences, that it is with them a great question, whether the Mouse that eateth the host, Hom. par. 3 quæst. 80 artic. 3. *do eate Christes bodie, or not: some affirme it, and some answere*

THE PROTESTANTS

signifie our spirituall washing. So that as we chãge not the substance of these creatures, without which they cannot bee a Sacrament, so we teach Christ to be receiued spiritually, and therefore most truly of the faithfull receiuer.

THE PAPISTS

swer, to say shee doth, is not greatly absurd, because the most wicked men doe eate it. Others say, that it miraculously ceaseth to bee Christes bodie. But seeing the first miracle is wrought by the words, I pray you howe hath the Mouse wrought this second miracle, in making it cease to be Christs bodie, and said nothing?

Glos. dist. 2 de consec. cap. Qui bene. Durand. rat. diu. lib. 4 rubr. 41.

Seeing this doctrine of Transubstantiation, doth bring with it, so grosse, or rather so monstrous absurdities, a man would thinke that no Christian would stand in defence of the same. For how can we not abhorre such teachers, as indeuour to make vs beleeue, that the most wicked persons may eate the flesh of Christ, Which whosoeuer eateth shall liue for euer, as our Sauiour Christ doth often tell vs. And yet to defend their Transubstantiation, they defend this as a good and fruitfull opinion. Who will folow such guides, as lead vs into such marishes, as themselues know no way to get out. Such is the question which before I touched, whether the Mouse doe eate the bodie of Christ if he eate the host. A question not mooued by vs, as Bellarmine would seeme to make men beleeue, and therefore would make vs like the Iewes, Pagans and Heritikes, but mooued and disputed by themselues, as may appeare by the master of Sentences, *lib. 4. dist. 13 in dist. 2. de consecrat. cap. Qui bene*: and also in the place before alledged out of Durand. Yea, Bellarmine is not a little troubled about this matter in the place next before alledged. For first hee setteth downe flatly, That although Christ be truly in the Sacramẽt, yet can he not be hurt, and therefore not eaten with Mice, but the formes onely

John 6.

Bel. de euch. lib. 3. ca. 9.

De Ecuhar. lib. 3. cap. 14.

ly

ly of bread may be eaten. The absurditie hereof I will not stand vpon in this place. But Bellarmine will shewe vs this by a demonstration: The Diuinitie (sayeth hee) is euerie where, & yet not cõsumed by fire, nor defiled by filth. Is this good diuinity, to make the body of Christ not subiect to corruption, because ỹ godhead is not: Glorified it is, and therfore not corruptible: but deified it is not. This seemeth to bee all one with the heresie of Nestorius, who taught that Christ had a deified bodie. But afterwards maister Bellarmine, perchaunce not liking very well of his first answere, seemeth to me to haue chaunged his opinion, as after shall appeare. But here in my iudgement he is of another minde than Durand hath learned of Pope Innocentius, of the which I spake before in the tempatison. For there Durand sayth, that it miraculously ceaseth to be Christs bodie. But, if we apply this similitude brought by Bellarmine, it should seeme that he will haue Christs body to remaine, but not to be hurt, as the deitie which is euerie where, cõtinueth, and yet is hurt of nothing. But if he be of one minde with Pope Innocentius, and Durand, I would then faine know, where that bodie of Christ that ceaseth to bee in that Mouseaten host, doth rest, or what becommeth of it. But in the ende of that Chapter: because manie (sayth he) mislike that Christes bodie should bee eaten of Mice, or beasts: When he was an infant, he might so bee and therefore why may hee not much more now in another shape, and when he cannot bee hurt thereby, bee eaten of them: Before he said, he could not bee eaten: Nowe hee sayth, he may. Whereby, it appeareth he knew not well what to say. These straights are they brought vnto, whilest they seeke to maintaine that their doctrine of Transubstantiation. Now beside these, and many other absurdities which follow this doctrine of transubstantiation, as that Christ hath his owne body: the darknes and hardnes of that doctrine is such, as that the schoolemen cannot agree vpon it, how Christs body should bee in the forme of bread.

See of this point Bell. de Euch. li. 1 ca. 9. in the beginning.

Whoso-

Whosoeuer should read the third book that master Bellarmine writeth of the Eucharist, wherein he endeuoureth to establish this doctrine, shall find it too hard for them that haue many yeares professed learning, to vnderstand their subtilties in this point. And who then can imagine that our sauiour Christ would deliuer vnto his Church for Sacraments which should bee common to all those things that should containe such hidden mysteries as the verie learned men cannot vnderstand? May Bellarm. thinketh it absurd so to thinke, or that saint Augustine would haue commended our Sacraments as most easie, when all the learned finde these popish opinions to be most intricate and hard. We haue seene the absurditie of this doctrine: now let vs view the weaknesse of the proofe. De Euch. li. 1. cap. 6. De doct. Christ. li. 3. cap. 9.

In the scriptures (for the most part) they can finde but one place, Take, eate, this is my bodie. For that which Eckius in his Enchiridion alledgeth out of the sixt of saint Iohn his Gospel, The bread which I will giue is my flesh, his owne friends thinke it not worth citing for this poynt. For what a reason is this? The breade which I saide before came downe from heauen is my flesh: therefore the Sacramentall bread is transubstantiated into the bodie of Christ. But for those wordes, This is my bodie, alledged out of the three first Euangelists, and saint Paul, because they are the verie rocke and refuge, which at all needes they haue recourse vnto, for helpe of this their doctrine of Transubstantiation, it would be somewhat particularly examined. Sundry arguments therefore I haue to induce me to affirme that this place can not proue transubstantiation. The first is this: If these words This is my body, do proue transubstantiation, then is that doctrine proued by plaine and expresse wordes of scripture: But, by expresse words of scripture that doctrine cannot be proued, therfore that place proueth not Trãsubstantiation: The truth of the first proposition is apparant, because either the plaine and literall sense of these wordes proue Tir. Transub. Ioh. 6. 51

that doctrine, or else it is not proued therby. And the minor or 2. proposition is not mine, but it is the words of Mel. Canus a learned Papist & of D. Chadsy. Therfore the first being true, and the second being by them confessed, the conclusion must needes be strong against them. The second argument maister Bellarmine will affoord me. The Sacraments are instituted and appointed by such wordes as may giue least occasion of errour or doubt, for this Bellarmine proueth in many words, and by many reasons, But so to expounde this place, that Transubstantiation should be forced out of it, bringeth many obscurities and doubts, therefore Transubstantiation is not to be proued out of these wordes. The first proposition is Bellarmines (as I haue sayd) and therefore I neede not proue it. That so to expound the wordes, This is my bodie, that Transubstantiation should be proued out of it, is to make Christ speake very obscurely and doubtfully, appeareth by their manifest wringing and wresting of the place. For the word (This) spoke by Christ, when he had the bread in his hand, they will not haue to be vnderstood of the bread, no, nor of the bodie of Christ, but somthing contained vnder the forme of bread, as Bellarmine out of Thomas of Aquine, and out of Guitmund teacheth. And I pray you, when shall the people vnderstand what that third thing is that is contained vnder those formes. But why should I looke for this at the hands of the vnlearned, seeing that the learnedst can not shew what this is. Are not such darke deuises the cause of many errours? Where now is (I pray you) that plainnesse and aptnes of speach in the institution of a sacrament, which before Bellarmine commended? Not in such vnsauorie subtilties. Yea, it is by him flatly confessed, that although, in respect of that regard they haue of the councels and the Church, their Diuines agree herein, yet in the maner thereof they disagree verie much. But what should I stand vpon this point? Bellarmine which in the first booke of the Eucharist, doth make his argument against Luther,

De locis Theol. li. 3. cap. 3. Disp. cum Pet. Mart. de Eucharistia.

De Eucha. li. 2. ca. 9.

Bellar. de Eucha. li. 1. cap. 11.

Bellarmi. de Eucha. li. 3. cap. 8.

cap. 9.

of

of the easinesse and of the plainnesse of the wordes that belong to the institution of the Sacrament, proouing that of necessitie they must so be, least thereby men should take occasion of errour or doubting, and condemneth Luthers doctrine as obscure: as though hee had beene then in a sound sleepe, and nowe were well wakened. In his third booke he commendeth their doctrine vnto vs concerning the Sacrament, because it is exceeding hard, and condemneth ours because it is so easie, that euery bodie may vnderstande it. Well, to be short, thus I reason, The wordes of the institution must be taken in the plainest sense or meaning: But that sense that is wrested out of them for Transubstantiation is not plaine: Therefore that sense of those wordes must not be taken that teacheth transubstantiation. Thirdly, the circumstances of the place it selfe are flat against this doctrine of transubstantiation. For if any thing els had bin signified by the worde This, then that which Christ tooke and brake, that is, the bread, it could not but verie much haue astonished them that were present, that speaking as it were of the bread, hee should haue meant any thing else. But to haue taught, that it had beene his very naturall bodie indeede, it would haue made them much more wonder than they did in the sixt of Saint Iohns Gospel, when they sayd, This is a hard saying, who can heare it. For, if they could not abide to heare our Sauiour Christ say, they must eate his flesh, and drinke his blood, howe much lesse would they not onely haue heard this saide againe, but also seeing him sit at the Table, and hauing taken bread into his hand, to pronounce that that bread was his naturall bodie, that was borne of the Virgine Marie, and that they must so eate him? But they knew, that about Sacraments, sacramentall speaches are to be vsed. And neuer imagined that because he said, This is my body, therefore that bread should bee chaunged in substaunce to the bodie of Christ, no more than there should be an alteration

lib. 3. cap. 8.

Ioh. 6. 60.

in Christ, because he sayth, I am the doore, I am the vine. yea no more than the cup it selfe was changed in the words of consecration into another thing. They knew, that it is not such a kinde of speach, as is vsed when God is purposed to make any thing: Let there be light: let there be a firmament. It is not a speach of cõmanding, but of shewing or declaring, when he sayth: This is my body. And therefore they made no such doubts, they did not so much as aske any question how it could bee, that he whose bodie they saw sitting with them at the table, could haue also another bodie, though inuisible, yet a verie true and naturall bodie, hidden in those formes of bread. And as the Apostles did neuer imagine so grosly of Christ, and so absurdly, that he had two bodies, the one visible, the other inuisible, the one sitting at the table, the other lurking in the formes of bread, but did eate that which Christ tooke, brake and gaue to them, that is to say, bread: so Saint Paule doeth flatly call it bread, yea, and that after the words of consecration. And although Bellarmine would seeme to answere this argument, and indeed iustly cyteth the answere which is commonly made to it, that it is called bread, not because it is so nowe, but because it was so: for, (sayeth hee) it is not needfull that if sometime that be vsed, yet that should bee vsed alwayes: yet neither will the answere that hee best liketh of serue the turne: For, (sayeth hee) it is called bread according to the Hebrew phrase, which calleth all meate by the name of bread. Now, to strike him with his owne weapon, if it bee so sometimes, must it so signifie alwayes? I am sure maister Bellarmine will not so say, for then shall wee doubt what it was that our Sauiour Christ tooke for the institution of the Sacrament. And if he dare not say, that so it must bee alwayes, then must hee giue better reason why heere it should not bee so, or else wee cannot beleeue him. Especially seeing the Apostle immediately before, speaking of the institution of the Sacrament,

Gen. 1.

1. Cor. 11. 27 28.

de Euchar. li. 3. cap. 14.

hath

hath shewed howe our Sauiour Christ tooke bread, which I trust maister Bellarmine will there confesse to bee bread in deed, and not other foode: why should hee then without proofe or reason, say here it is more generally taken, to applie it perchaunce to the foode of the soule? Yea, this replie may serue for all the answeres that hee hath to this argument, because it is not inough for him to say, such a worde may so bee taken sometime, but hee must proove that it must in this place so be taken. Moreouer, if you consider of that which they call the forme of bread, it is no other in colour, taste, or fashion, than it was: it putrifieth and corrupteth as soone as when it is not consecrated. Which to affirme, if it were transubstantiated into the bodie of Christ, were in my mind absurd and blasphemous. Lastly, we see by the practise that the godly haue sometime vsed, that the fathers in the primitiue Church thought not the bread to be transubstantiated: For if they had knowne of any transubstantiation, they woulde not haue burned that which remained of the Eucharist, as Hesichius, and also Origen vpon Leuiticus shew that they did. Thus then by many reasons, I trust it sufficiently appeareth, that the church of Rome cannot without great violence done to the place, wring trãsubstantiation out of these words, this is my body: for Christ is many things by similitude, which he is not in deed, a rocke, a doore, &c. as saith S. August. And so we may see the words to be most easie and plaine, if according to the maner of such sacramentall speaches, we vnderstand the worde (Is.) The rocke was Christ, that is, it was a figure of Christ: so here, This is my body, that is, ỳ figure of my bodie, as S Augustine most plainly expoũdeth in this place, saying: The lord made no doubt to say, this is my body, when he gaue the figure of his bodie. And thus much to take frõ them that one weapon which they haue wrested frõ the scriptures to fight against vs withal. Now ỳ which they can bring against vs out of the writings of men, can haue no such force, and therfore is not so dangerous.

Hesich. in Leuit.
Orig. in Leuit.
In Ioh. tract. 47.
1. Cor. 10.
Cont. Adimant. c. 12.

Answer to the places out of the Fathers for transubstantiation.

And yet it will not be amisse, to take a shorte viewe of that which they alledge out of the Fathers of the purer ages, namely that liued fiue hundred, or sixe hundred yeares after Christ. Iustinus Martyr is the first whom he nameth, out of whom he gathereth, That the meate whereof our flesh is nourished, that is the bread sanctified by the prayer of the worde of God, is the bodie of the Lorde. Wherein I note first, that because hee speaketh of meate, wherof our flesh is nourished, he acknowledgeth no change of the substance of the bread: for it must be the substance of the bread that nourisheth our bodies, no change, I say, but Sacramentall, in regard whereof, he hath said a little before, that we receiue it not as common bread, because that being so sanctified, it is a Sacrament of the bodie of our sauior Christ. Thē, the substance of the bread being proued, euen by these wordes, to remaine, it is nothing hard to see what he meaneth, when he sayth, it is the bodie of the Lord. For it is nothing else then it is, that is, it signifieth the bodie of the Lord. Which exposition I haue from himselfe, who saith in an other place, That Christ hath deliuered vs bread, for the Remembrance of his bodie that is taken vp (into heauen.) Where he doth not onely shew the Sacrament to be a Memoriall of Christs bodie, which here is to be proued, but also, that his bodie is absent and in heauē, in that he saith, it is for a remēbrance of his body that is taken vp. And in the same booke afterwards, ꝑ same father saith, that By the dry and moist nourishment (the bread & wine) weare admonished of those things, which it is said Christ hath suffred for vs. Where, by calling thē nourishment, & that of our bodies, for such nourishment belongeth to thē, he plainly denieth any alteration of the substance in those visible signes: and then further sheweth the true vse of ꝑ sacramēt, which is, to admonish vs of Christs suffring for vs. Out of Iren. he allegeth these wordes: How shal they know, that that bread wherin thanks are giuē, is the body of their lord: but ꝑ Iren. did not dreame there of any

Inst. Apol. 2 neer the end

Colcum Trypho. Iudæo.

Iren. lib. 4. cap. 34.

any Transubstantiation, it is plaine by his wordes that follow immediately, when he saith, that the Eucharist consisteth of two things, the earthly, and the heauenly. If the bread were transubstantiate, it could not be called an earthly thing. Moreouer, hee writeth in that place against the heretikes that sayd, there was another God the father, besides him that made all things. Nowe he inferreth, if they should say true, howe shall they knowe that that bread is the bodie of their Lord? Whereby it appeareth, that his purpose is here, not to shew what is in that bread, but which Lord it representeth vnto them: As the verie next wordes in that sentence declare, which are these, If they say not, that he is the sonne of him that made the world: so that the chiefest force of this reason after Irene his true meaning, is in this word, Their Lord. And besides, to call the signe by the name of that which it signifieth, the bodie of Christ, for the sacrament of the bodie of Christ, is verie agreeable vnto the Scriptures: but such maner of speaches are but a weake proofe for transubstantiation. Next commeth in Tertullian, but so maimed & mangled, that thereby maister Bellarmine proclaimeth vnto the world, that he meant nothing lesse, than to haue the truth knowne. Out of him hee alledged these wordes: The bread which he tooke he made his bodie, saying: this is my bodie. A man would thinke this were a very plaine place, but Bellarmine dealeth falsly herein. For when Tertullian hath spoken for him what he would haue him, then he stoppeth his mouth least he marre all. For the very next wordes are, that is the figure of his bodie. Nowe, let vs take the whole sentence together, and so trie what hee can make of it. The bread which hee tooke hee made his bodie, saying: this is my bodie, that is, the figure of my bodie. And after also, to shew what he meant by that he saide he made it his bodie, he deliuereth it in other termes, he calleth it his bodie. If then maister Bellarmine will aske, how the bread can bee made his bodie? Tertullian

Con. Marcionem li. 4. neer the ende

Li. de Euch. 3. cap. 18. telleth how, Sacramentally, or figuratiuely. So that this bold question of maister Bellarmine commeth out of season, like a triumph before the conquest. His fourth witnesse that he produceth, is Cyprian, whose wordes are these: Cyp. de cœna domini. This bread which the Lord did reach to his disciples, being changed, not in shape or forme, but in nature, by the omnipotencie of the worde, is made flesh. This testimonie hee esteemeth as the club of Hercules, that no man can withstand: and therefore in another place, alleadging it, he sayth thus: De Euch. li. 2 cap. 9. This testimonie cannot bee answered, although the aduersaries haue often assayed to answere it. Let vs then examine a little this vnanswerable place. And first, it is confessed by Bellarmine, that that booke is not Cyprians, and therefore the father of that booke is vncertaine, but yet wee will not denie it, but answere the place, if we can. How the bread is made flesh, hath beene sufficiently declared in the answer to the former arguments: so that all the hardnesse is in this, howe the bread is chaunged, not in forme, but in nature. First, that is true in respect of the vse that it is put to: For as it is a sacrament, and representeth vnto vs our nourishment in Christ: so must it truely nourish our bodies, it beeing chaunged in vs to that ende, and nowe, not the accidents, but the substaunce of bread, can worke this nourishment. And therefore, if wee take nature for substaunce, it may well so be expounded, and agree with that which Iustinus Martyr sayeth, as before is saide. And admit, that nature doeth here signifie substaunce, let vs see what they can proove by it. They say the substance of the bread ceasseth, and is quite taken away: But Cyprian sayeth, the bread is but chaunged in nature, but still it remayneth bread you see, for hee so calleth it. Therefore because he vttereth it in such a maner, it is most certaine, that he meaneth not by that worde nature, the substance of bread, but something else. Nature therefore is somtime taken for the disposition, or for the propertie or vse of a thing,

as

as the authour of the booke of Wisdome sayth, That God had giuen him knowledge, of the nature of beasts. In like maner, Rom. 1.26. We were by nature (saith saint Paul) the children of wrath. And saint Iames saith, The whole nature of beasts, hath beene tamed by the nature of man. So that this word nature, very often doth not signifie the substance. And here it cannot signifie the substance of the bread, because the substance of it cannot be changed, but ẏ it must also be annihilated, or brought to nought, therfore he speaketh but of the vse or propertie of it, that it is altered. And doctor Chadsey, a learned Papist, as was any in Oxford in his time, doth confirme this my answer: For when Peter Martir disputing against D. Tresham, had prested him with an authoritie of Theodorets, which was this: Christ honored those signes which we see, with the names of his bodie and blood, yet not changing the nature, but to nature adding grace. And he (as it seemeth) not liking well of D. Tresham his answer, this Doctor Chadsey disputing another day, tooke vpon him to answer such places as master Martyr had before alledged against master Tresham: and amongst others he answereth this place out of Theodoret thus: I say that Thodoret meaneth as other fathers doe, who, when they say that the nature remayneth, they meane the propertie of the bread. I trust then, it will not bee anie heresie for mee to expounde nature, the properties of the bread, seeing doctor Chadsey a catholike doth it. We see then, that this vnanswerable argument, that he made so great account of, and bragged that it could neuer be answered, is long since fully answered by one of his owne friends, & he knew not of it. Ciril is his fift witnes, not that learned father that was bishop of Alexandrie, but another that was B. of Ierusalē, whose bookes are but lately set forth by thē selues, that now bring him in for a witnes, & therfore we may doubt whether he be wel delt wal. Out of him he alegeth 3. places: He once turned water into wine, & shal he not be worthy

Sap. 7.20
Ephes. 2.3
Iam. 3.7
Dialog. 2
Ciril. Ieruſ. cathec. Mistagog. 4

to be trusted that he turned wine into bloud. Behold here (sayth maister Bellarmine) a reall change. And why so? I knowe he will answere: because it was so in the water, for it was really changed into wine: and therfore also saint Iohn, who reporteth the storie, saith, it was a myracle. Now to change wine into bloud, is as great a miracle, and therefore it is likely, that if there had bin any such miracle wrought, some or other would haue noted it for a miracle, seeing so many haue spokē of that matter: namely three Euangelists, and S. Paul. Maister Bell. knoweth, that the fathers vse many times to speake verie hyperbolically, and to amplify with excessiue speaches ꝑ matters that they would set forth, as here this Ciril doth: & yet we must not gather thereof such a real change in the wine, as I haue said was in the water: but this is spoken to win that at our hands, that he in that place moueth vs vnto, that we should not thinke the sacramentall wine to bee but bare wine. His second witnesse for maister Bellarmine, is after in that place, Vnder the forme of bread, the bodie is giuen, and in forme of wine, the bloud. Wherupon maister Bellarmine againe insulteth thus: Behold the accidents of bread which remaine. We grant it, but not the accidents or shew of bread only, but the substance also, and that he hath not yet denied: therefore let vs see his third place. Knowe this for a certaintie, that this bread which is seene of vs, is not bread, though thy tast perceiue it to be bread. Indeed hee speaketh here farre otherwise than the auncient fathers doe, in that hee sayeth, It is not bread: For there is not one of the fathers, for at the least six hundred yeeres after Christ, that euer spake so, but this man onely. And therefore howsoeuer he amplifieth the matter in wordes, to bring vnto the holy Sacraments due regarde, which the fathers at those times vpon great causes did much endeuour, yet he is not to be thought to haue meant otherwise than that hee sayd before, that it is no more common bread. For although if they regarde but the taste, they shall finde

Iohn 2, 11

Cater. Mist. 3

finde no change, yet that sacrament is an authenticall seale of our faith, which assureth vs, that Christ is spiritually giuen vnto vs. And thus much briefly of these authorities: that men may see, that they are not so very plaine, that infallible arguments may be gathered out of them.

But now I must needes speake somewhat of the Author. And first for the Booke it selfe, out of which these places are alleaged, it seemeth to me, that saint Hierome hath somewhat burnt it in the eare, when he saith, that hee wrote it when hee was but a young man, noting thereby (perchance) his yong and slender iudgement. And of himselfe Ruffinus saith, That hee did change sometime in faith, and in Communion often. And Socrates in his Ecclesiasticall history saith of him, that being summoned to answere some accusations that were laid against him, he fearing to come to his triall, for two yeares together appeared not, and therefore was deposed. What reason then, that wee should be content to stand to his triall for matters in question, that was himselfe afraide to be tried by the learned men of his time: Or that hee who was deposed from his seate, by them that best knew him (yea, and that, as it seemeth by Ruffinus his saying of him, for some heresie) should now sit as Iudge, yea or else be allowed as witnes in so weighty matters? As for saint Ambrose, whom next he alleageth, he maketh not against vs. He saith indeede, that the bread is that which Nature hath formed, but that Blessing hath hallowed. Which is nothing else but that which hath beene answered before, that it is not common bread, but as Theodoret saith, the Nature not being changed, to Nature is Grace added. And that this is S. Ambrose his meaning, is most plaine, (not only by that which he afterwardes saith in that very chapter, Before the blessing of the heauenly wordes, an other thing is named: after the consecration, the bodie of Christ is signified) but also most euidently in his bookes of the Sacraments: where speaking of the change that

Lib. Eccles. hist. 2. ca. 23.

Lib. 2. ca. 40.

De iis qui initiantur mist. cap. 9.

Theod. Immutabil. dialog. 1.

Lib. 4. cap. 4.

is

is in these visible signes, hee vseth these wordes: If there bee so great vertue in the worde of the Lorde Iesus, that the thinges that were not, beganne to bee, how much rather can it worke that they (the visible signes in the Sacrament) bee that which they were, and be changed into an other thing. By which hee can meane no other but a sacramentall change, because hee flatly affirmeth, that these signes are that which they were. The first place that hee alleageth out of Chrysost. is this: It is he that doth sanctifie these things (the outward elements and change them: but that hee speaketh of a sacramental change only, his owne wordes a litle before, in that place, do proove. For, in teaching how that by these sensible creatures, he deliuereth vnto vs things not sensible, hee bringeth his example of Baptisme, wherein I know they will not say the water is transubstantiated. And yet Chrysostome maketh no difference betweene it and the sacrament of Christes body and blood, but that in them both, in like sort by sensible creatures, insensible graces are deliuered. But most plainely in an other place doeth he confute that which the Papists woulde force out of these wordes, namely, the change of the substance of the bread, saying: Before the bread is sanctified, wee call it bread, but the diuine grace hauing sanctified it by the Priest, it is freed from the name of bread, and is vouched worthy of the name of the Lordes body, although the nature of the bread abide in it. Whereby wee see, the change that hee speaketh of is in the vse, not in the substance of the bread. In the latter place Chrysostome saieth thus: Doest thou see bread, doest thou see wine? doe these thinges goe to the draught as other meates doe? God forbid. Thinke not so. For as waxe being put into the fire is made like vnto it, none of the substance remaineth, nothing aboundeth: euen so heere thinke the mysteries to bee consumed by the substance of the body.

In Matth. Hom. 83.

Ad Cæsarium monachum.

De Euchar. in encæniis.

In

In which words he bringeth nothing for Popish transubstantiation. For although they doe teach, that the substance of the bread is perished, yet the accidentes they teach still to remaine, and euer they say, that Christ is present in the sacrament vnder the formes of bread and wine: But when wax is cast into the fire, there is not so much as a shew that there hath beene wax, but all is consumed: Therefore this similitude maketh not for transubstantiation. And in trueth whosoeuer shall reade that whole sermon, shall easily perceiue, that Chrysost. there doeth but by rhetoricall amplifications exhort the people, so to be affected when they come vnto the holy sacrament, that their eie shoulde not bee occupied about anie earthly creatures, but their minde altogether exercised in heauenly cogitations, according (saith he) vnto the promise that you made vnto the Priest when as hee saide, Lift vp your mindes and hearts, and you answered, I haue it lifted vp vnto the Lord. Which is according to the councell which hee giueth vnto vs in an other place, that especially in these holie mysteries, wee shoulde not onely beholde that which is before our eyes, but especially remember his wordes. But it were too tedious to answere euery place particularly that they doe alleadge, and out of this which is already spoken, it is easie to answere any thing that they can bring out of the fathers for fiue or sixe hundred yeares. But if any man will aske, why our sauiour Christ doth giue vnto the bread the name of his Bodie, and to the wine, the name of his Blood: And why the fathers doe so call these outward signes, the bodie and blood of our sauiour Christ, I will answere with Theodoret an ancient father: Hee would haue them that are partakers of the diuine mysteries, not to bee occupied in thinking of the nature of the thinges that are seene, but in respect of the change of the name, to beleeue the change that is made through grace.

Chrysost. in Matth. hom. 83

Dial. 2. Immutabili.

As for the Councels which they bring for proofe of this doctrine, the first of them was more than a thousand yeeres after Christ, whereby it may appeare, how late this doctrine is: whereupon Scotus a schooleman doeth confesse, that this transubstantiation was not a doctrine of faith before the councel of Lateran, although Bellarmine reproue him for it. Seeing now this their lately hatched doctrine doeth bring with it so many absurdities, is darkened with so many doubtes, hath no warrant in the Scriptures, no ground in the ancient fathers, and is not to be accounted as an article of faith (euen by the confession of them that speake of the greatest antiquitie of it much more than fiue hundred yeares since:) let vs take heed of them, who crie continually, Antiquitie, Antiquitie, and yet indeuour to bring in new doctrines and deuises of their owne, and to turne away the hearts of the ignorant from the true ancient faith, deliuered by Christ and his apostles, and sincerely preserued many hundred yeeres in the church of God. But of this, because it is one of the speciall points of doctrine wherein we dissent, I haue stoode longer.

Bellarm. de Eucha. lib. 3 cap. 23

That the wicked receiue not in the Sacrament Christs bodie and blood.

Chap. 14

The Protestants	The Papists
BEcause that whosoeuer hath eaten the sonne hath the sonne (for hee is meate that perisheth not) and	BVt the Church of Rome, *forgetting that the Sacrament consisteth of twoo things, that is to say, the materiall*

Ioh. 6. 50

Iren. lib. 4 cap. 34.

THE PROTESTANTS

1. Ioh. 5. 12 and he that hath the sonne hath life. And on the contrary, as saint *Augustine* saith, *He can not eate Christs body, that is not in his body.* Lastly, seeing he can not be torn with the teeth, but must be receiued by faith, wee therefore teach, that although the wicked may be partakers of the visible signes, yet they can not be said to eate or receiue the body and blood of our saiuiour Christ. And with Saint *Augustine*, that they may eate, as *Iudas* did the Lords bread, against the Lord, but the bread the Lorde, they can not eate: which doctrine is most plaine, and bringeth with it no absurdities or doubts

De ciuit. Dei lib. 21. ca. 25 De consecra. dist. 2. vt quid para: ex Augustino,

In Ioh. tract. 59

THE PAPISTS

teriall breade, and that which came down from heauen, which is Christ: do adde vnto these a third, namely the effect of the body of Christ, or his spirituall graces: making thereby a separation, and, as it were, a diuorce betweene the bodie of Christ, which they teach the wicked may receiue, and those graces which can not in deede bee separated from the same, and cannot be giuen to the vngodly. Whereby they do wrap themselues in such a cloud of doubts, as all the Papists in the world, wil neuer be able to answer: whilest some say, that this body goeth no further than to the teeth: some allowe it to haue passage but to the stomake, but not to abide there: some to continue there also: yea, some say that it goeth as other meate into the belly, & yet remaineth stil Christs body so long as the forme of the bread remaineth: yea, and that it may be voided either vpward or downward, and receiued of man or beast.

Bellarm. de Eucha. li. 3 cap. 13

M. Bilson. part. 4.

Although this vnreconcileable difference that is among them, in so materiall a point of their religion, namely, what is becom of the body of Christ, after the wicked haue receiued the same: and these filthy blasphemies, and detestable shifts that they are driuen vnto, for defence of their

heresie,

herelie, be a sufficient confutation, both of that doctrine of transubstantiation, from whence doe spring all these filthie puddes and sinckes, and also of this other, that the wicked may eate the body of Christ, which is but a sowre grape of that vnkindely roote: yet for the better satisfying of the ignorant, I will (by Gods assistance) take a short view of their arguments, whereby they indeuour to proue that the most wicked men may eate the body and drinke the blood of Christ. Now their chiefe and almost onely proofe is taken from transubstantiation: of the vntrueth of which doctrine, I trust I haue spoken sufficiently in the former chapter.

And now therefore, that I may conclude, that if the wicked can not eate the body of Christ, vnlesse the bread be changed into the bodie, as themselues will confesse: then, because there is no such change, therefore the wicked eate not his body. But one shew of an argument they make out of the scriptures: He that eateth and drinketh vnworthily, is guiltie of the body and blood of the Lord, and after, eateth and drinketh iudgement vnto himselfe, making no difference of the Lordes bodie. Out of which place they reason to this effect: The wicked or vnworthy receiuers, can not be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, vnlesse they receiue it: But they are guiltie of them, and receiue iudgement to themselues thereby: Therefore they receiue the bodie and blood of the Lord. The *minor* or second proposition is true, for saint Paul saith it. But the first is most false. For although the wicked can not be, neither are partakers of the bodie and blood of Christ: yet because they come not to the sacrament which was instituted of God (to offer and assure vs of the heauenly graces) with such reuerence as they ought to do, and in such sincerity as behoueth them, therefore are they accounted (and that woorthily) to despise the things themselues that are represented by those visible signes. And this is it that S. Paul findeth fault with the

1. Cor. 11. 27, 29

Corin-

Corinthians: For that by despising the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, they shewed their contempt of the thing signified thereby. And therefore S. Ambrose saith euen vpon these words: Because it is the Lorde, whose blood he drinketh in mystery. S. Hierome yeeldeth the reason why he is guiltie of the body & blood of Christ, Because he hath accounted as vile, the Sacrament (marke his wordes) of so great a mysterie. Not therefore are they guiltie because they eate Christ, but because (saith hee) they despise the Sacrament of so great a mysterie. And Theophilact vppon these wordes saieth, Hee that receiueth it vnworthily, shall bee no lesse guiltie of wickednesse, than if hee shed the very blood of the Lord. Where we see, that Theophilact doth compare the vnworthy receiuing of the holie sacrament, with the shedding of Christes blood, and so maketh them two diuerse things. And therefore, in his iudgement, it is not all one to receiue the Sacrament, and to receiue Christ. So that by these places it appeareth, that the wicked may bee guiltie of the body and blood of Christ, which are by the holy Sacrament represented and sealed vp vnto the faithfull, and yet not receiue the body and blood of Christ. Yet by the way, I must needs note the false dealing of Andradeus a popish writer, who to make the Apostles argument the stronger for him, doeth falsifie his wordes. And therefore where the Apostle saith, hee that eateth of this bread, and drinketh of the Lordes cup vnworthily, he saith, Hee that eateth the Lordes body, and drinketh of his blood. But it is no great fault in poperie to abuse the Scriptures, and to adde to them, or take from them, as they thinke good. Wee see therefore, that this cleane meate is for cleane men: this holy banquet is for holy guests, as they had wont to crie. For, as saint Ambrose saith, This bread is the foode but of the godlie. And why? because, Our abiding in him, is our eating of him, and our drinking of him, is our incorporating into

Ambros.

Hierome.

Theophilact

Orthod. explic. lib. 7.

De benedict. patriarch. c. 9

Cypr. de cœna Domini.

into him, our seruices being subiected, our willes conioyned, and our affections vnited (to him.) Therefore the eating of his flesh, is a certaine earnestnesse and desire to abide in him. Which things to be in the vngodly, the Papists will in no wise affirme. Many testimonies might be alleaged, but with one shift they thinke to answer all. Christ his body and blood (say they) may be receiued of the wicked, but not the fruit or effect thereof. And may Christ be receiued of any, and they not to liue by him? Can he that is full of all grace and power, be at any time, as it were, robbed of the same? God forbid. For, if they wil speake of his conuersing among the Iewes, and of his being among many whilest he was vpon earth, that got no good thereby, the reason thereof is plaine: it was because they receiued him not. But to say, that any may receiue him, and is not partaker of his graces and benefites, is most expressly against the wordes of our Sauiour Christ, He that eateth me, shall liue through me. They can not therefore offer a greater disgrace to our Sauiour Christ, than to say, that any can receiue him, and yet not be partakers of his heauenly graces. So that whilest they take vpon them the defence of the wicked in some sort, they set themselues, euen wilfully to reproch the holy one of Israel. But if it should be granted to them, that the wicked may eate Christ, how, or when wil they agree, what shall be done with that body & blood of Christ that they so eate? For themselues deny, that the soules of the wicked are nourished by him. And that their bodies should by his body be nourished is too absurd. What then becommeth of his body and blood, which they say the wicked receiue? To answer this question resolutely and definitiuely, they haue not yet agreed, they neuer will, they neuer can. Therefore, vntill they can answere directly to such inconueniences, as of necessitie follow the doctrine that they teach, let vs beleeue, that Christ is the foode of the faithfull onely, because none other but they do receiue him. Let vs not heare them,

The answer of the Papists.

Confutation of it.

Ioh. 3. 19, 20.

Ioh. 6. 57.

them, who in the sacraments, which should be, and are in deede most plaine and easie; teach vs wholy to looke for miracles, as doe the Papists. For Christ is present by miracle, and absent by miracle, if they say true. And so, when all learning and scriptures faile, then they perswade vs, that we must seeke for a wonder, and so make them that will giue credite to them in these their grosse deuises, the wonders of the world for their folly. But enough of this.

That the Cup ought not to be denied vnto the lay people, which thing the Papists do.

CHAP. 15.

THE PROTESTANTS

BEcause it is needeful for the nourishment of our bodies, to haue, not meate onely, to satisfie our hunger, but drinke also to quench our thirst in. And that Christ would represent vnto vs in his Sacrament, the perfect nourishment of our soules, whereto nothing could be added, because that nothing should be wanting: For this cause did our Sauiour Christ institute his sacrament

THE PAPISTS

SO that the church of Rome, not regarding the expresse commandement of our Sauiour Christ, neither the practise of Gods Church, much more then a thousand yeeres after Christ, neither that fulnes of comfort that wee learne by the bread & wine, that Christ is vnto vs both meate and drinke, that is the perfect and sufficient foode of our hungry and thirstie soules, haue robbed the lay people of the one halfe of the

THE PROTESTANTS

ment of these two partes of our nourishment, and gaue as well the one of them as the other vnto his Apostles: Commanding them also aswel to take & drinke of the cup, as to eate of the bread. And the Church also did practise this more than a thousand yeeres. But of late, the councel of Constance, Anno 1415. did forbid it, and commaund the Sacrament to be receiued but in one kinde.

Sess. 13.

THE PAPISTS

Lordes supper, proclaming thereby vnto the world, that they are disobedient against Christes commaundement, iniurious to his people, and that in steede of the continuall and auncient practise of the Primitiue Church, they establish their owne new deuise. Lo, what cause haue they to bragge of their ancient faith?

And for the vpholding of this their doing, against both Trueth and Antiquitie, they bring some reasons. Fisher sometime bishop of Rochester in his booke against the assertions of Luther, to defende that it was lawfull for the church to alter the institution of Christ, and therefore to take awaie the cup from the lay people, alleadgeth the example of the Apostles, who are saide to baptise in the name of Christ only, whereas the sacrament of baptisme, was commaunded, *In the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the holie Ghost*. But, to bishop Fisher the papist, I oppose Bellarmine the Iesuite, and a papist who writing of the sacrament of baptisme, plainelie denieth, that the Apostles baptised in the name of Christ only, and largely proueth it: and sheweth, that where it is saide, that they baptised in the name of Iesus, or in the Lordes name, the meaning is, that they baptised in the faith of Iesus, or by his authoritie, or with baptisme which he instituted, or in his name, but not in his name only. So that this reason which Fisher maketh for to proue the authoritie

Artic. 16.

Acts 8. 16. & 10. 48

Matth. 28. 19.

Lib. 1. cap. 3.

thoritie of the church heerein, is verie sufficiently answered by Master Bellarmine. It is therefore needefull, hee shoulde make a supplie of some other argument, to proue that, seeing hee hath taken that weapon out of their handes. Let vs therefore see how hee mendeth the matter. *The church* (saith hee) *may ordaine, and prescribe those thinges, that belong not to the substaunce of the sacramentes, and are not ordered by the word of God: But the rite of eating vnder one kinde, or vnder two, is such: Therefore it maie bee ordered and prescribed of the Church.* These are his verie wordes: this is his argument, whereof the maior or first proposition, (as himselfe saith) is most true, and therefore wee graunt it: but the minor, which is, that to eate in one kinde, or in both kindes, is not of the substaunce of the sacrament, or ordered by the word of God, that is most false. And because it containeth two pointes, I will briefly touch them both. Where he saith it is not of the substance of the sacrament, whether we receiue in one kinde or in two: it is in my iudgement, euen against all reason and testimony of antiquity, and the very nature of a sacrament. For the sacrament must needes consist of matter and forme. The matter is the bread and wine (I speake of that which Irene calleth the earthly matter.) To the forme of this Sacrament belong these wordes, *He brake breade, and gaue them, and saide: take, eate, this is my bodie. Hee tooke the cup, blessed and saide, drinke yee all of this.* Yea and neither of these can be wel omitted, but that therby we are the lesse occasioned to meditate, of the efficacy of Christs death & passion. For, as the breaking of the bread that it might be giuen to vs, þ our bodies might be nourished thereby, is a representation of Christes body which was for vs tormented: so the drinking of the cup is the representation of the shedding of Christs bloud for vs. Moreouer let vs consider, what is that which they would haue the material part or rather a substantial part in this sacramẽt. To receiue the sacrament as appeares by þ censure

De Euch. lib. 4. cap. 11.

Iren. li. 4. ca. 34

Matth. 26. 26 [27]

Expl. dialog. 9. expl. Theol. lib. 7.

of Collen, and Andradius, but in what kinde it is receiued is not materiall (say they:) Marke their boldenesse. In the institution there is not one word that willeth vs in such generall termes to receiue the Eucharist or Sacrament, but expresse wordes to will vs, to Take and eate the bread, and to drinke of the cup: and yet that which God doth not mention, they will haue to be of the substance of a sacrament: and that which is expressly set downe in the word, they may chuse whether they wil doe it, or not.

De Euch. li. 4. cap. 18.

But how doth Bellarmine proove, that the rite of communicating in on or two kindes, belongeth not to the substance of the sacrament. The vse of a thing (saith he) that is permanent, is not the substance of it: but, the communicating is the vse of the sacrament, which sacrament is a thing permanent: Therefore the communicating in one or two kindes is not the substance of it. The whole force of this argument consisteth in that which is chiefly in question amongst vs, that is, whether the sacrament is a thing permanent, or not. And we vpon iust cause deny it. And therefore his argument is a plaine fallacie, called the begging of the thing that is in question, and can bee no strong reason against vs. By a thing permanent they vnderstand, that the Eucharist is not onely a Sacrament (as they say their other sacraments are, and as baptisme is in respect of the vse and receiuing of it) but also that it being consecrated once to be a sacrament, continueth so to bee, whether it be receiued or not. Which opinion they holde stiffely for the maintenance of their adoration, and carrying it about. For they teach it still to bee a sacrament, howsoeuer they vse it. Out of which absurde principle hee gathereth this false and detestable doctrine, that they may change this point of Christs institution, as they will.

But wee knowing, that the Sacraments are onelie helpes for our infirmities, and instituted to supply our wants, and that the eating of the bodily foode in the Sacrament, and so applying it to the nourishment of our

our bodies, is that which representeth vnto vs most liuely our receiuing of Christ by a true faith, to the nourishment of our soules: detest and despise those captious and curious subtilties whereby the papistes doe seeke to defend their wonderfull boldnesse, in changing the very institution, and in breaking the expresse commaundement of Christ. Wherein wee haue for our warrant, the worde of Christ, which bidden vs eate and drinke (and therefore it can not be but arrogant presumption for man to forbid that which Christ hath commaunded, howsoeuer hee will pretend, that it is not of the substance of the Sacrament.) We haue also the practise in the primitiue church, which is testified by Ischius, which vsed for to burne that which remained of the sacrament: Origen also reporteth the same. Which they would not haue don, if they had thought as do the papists, that it had beene transubstantiated into Christs body, or else that it had beene, as heere they affirme, a sacrament, although it be not receiued as Christ commaunded it should be.

In Leuit. lib. 2. cap. 8.

Seeing therefore these men that would seeme pillars in the church of Christ, doe picke quarrelles at his ordinance, and make exception to his commaundement, and all to wriche their neckes out of his yoke, and to free themselues from his lawes, like lewd seruauntes, which will not frame themselues to doe that which woulde best please their maisters, but that onely which they must bee forced to doe whether they will or not: let vs nowe see how in the second point, they do seeke to peruert the verie decree it selfe that Christ set down concerning this matter, to make men beleeue, that hee meant no such thing, as in trueth he did.

The second part of his assertion is, that it is not ordered by the word of God, what shall be done in that point. This is an intollerable boldenesse. Doth not our saiour Christ take order, as well for the cup, as for the bread? Doth not he that saieth, Take, eate, say also, Drinke ye

all of this? If any man will answere as Bellarmine doth
De Euchar. lib. 4. cap. 27. in one place, that they were not both giuen at one time, and therefore that properly to speake, the Supper of the Lord consisteth but of one kind, he should plainly declare, that he hath rather a desire to contend than to knowe the trueth. For what is it to vs how long time was betweene the one commaundement and the other, so that we know, that both the one and the other is instituted of Christ. Yea
1. Cor. 11. the Apostle saint Paul very plainely telleth vs, that the order both for the cup and the bread is deliuered to him of the Lord, That which I receiued of the Lord, I deliuered vnto you. And then hee sheweth Christs institution for the bread and also the cup. But with full mouth, and one consent they tell vs, that that commaundement belongeth to the Apostles onely, and not to all the disciples.
Math. 26. 26 And yet saint Mathew saith, he gaue it to his disciples. Yea, and Christ commaundeth, Drinke yee all of this: And hath not saide concerning the bread, eate ye all of this (although wee deny not, that euery one hauing prooued themselues should eate of it.) But seeing God hath giuen a more expresse commaundement vnto all for the cup, than for the bread, why should they rather restraine lay men from receiuing the cup, than from the bread? Againe, doeth he not say to all them, Drinke yee all of this, to whome before hee saide, Take eate? Yes verily, for the text is plaine, both in the Euangelists and saint Paule. But the bread must be giuen to al, they confesse, therefore why not the cup also? And that which saint Paule wrote concerning the vse of the Sacrament, it is plaine he wrote vnto all the church of Corinth (not onely by that place
1. Cor. 1. 2. which Kemnitius alleadgeth, To all that call vppon the name of the Lorde, and that hee writeth vnto the
De Euchar. lib. 4. cap. 25. church of Corinth, which Bellarmine doeth seeke to answere, rather least he should seeme to say nothing, than that in truth he saith anie thing worth the setting downe) but also by the punishment that followed the abuse of the sacra-

sacrament. For this cause many are weake and feeble amongst you, and many sleepe. Which came vpon them, not that did eate of that bread onely, but also that dranke of that cup vnworthily. And it cannot be imagined, that either the ministers were so bad at that time so generally, that so many of them would haue offended therein: or if the fault had beene in them, the Apostle would more particularly haue reproued them: neither were they then so many in one place, that it could haue beene truely saide of them, that many are weake, and many sleepe, or are dead. Therefore, whereas many were punished amongst the Corinthians for vnworthily receiuing both the bread and the cup, and this word (Many) cannot, as I haue prooued be there referred to their Teachers onely, it followeth that this punishment was amongest the lay men, as well at the last, as amongst their ministers: and therefore that the lay men in the church of Corinth receiued the cup.

And thus much of that wicked assertion, wherein they doe affirme, that it is lawfull for the church to alter this part of Christes institution, and also to take away the cup.

Nowe to a second, and as wicked a proposition as the other. Wherein they teach, that it is needelesse to be receiued in both kindes. And to proue this, Bellarmine taketh some paines in three whole chapters. In the first two he sheweth, that the whole sacrament may be receiued vnder one kinde: and therefore in the last hee teacheth, that no more good is to be gotten of the sacrament vnder both kindes, than vnder one. And although we can not allowe of that concomitance, as it is termed, that is, that inseparable coniunction of the body and blood vnder either of the signes, which especially hee prooueth in the first chapter of those three, namely, the one and twentieth, that the whole substance of a sacrament is found in either kinde, as hee

De Euch. lib. 4. cap. 21, 22, 23

teacheth in the two and twentieth chapter: yet if we should grant those two points, that which master Bellarmine would conclude in the three and twentieth chapter can not follow. For what if Christ may bee wholy receiued vnder one kinde: Yet it should not follow, that vnder one as effectually he may be receiued, as vnder both. For, as before I shewed, his death is more liuely represented by the bread, and his bloudshedding by the wine. And that which more effectually representeth it, is more profitable than that which lesse representeth the same. And it is too much sawcinesse so to controll the wisedome of God, that when hee saith, Drinke yee all of this, which is a plaine commandement, any foolish man dare say: It is to no profite: it can do you no good. As for the causes that are alleaged by Gerson and other, why the popish church thought good to take away the cup from the lay people, they are so foolish and friuolous, that a man would think rather that they iested, than spake in earnest. But what cause soeuer man can pretend to alter ỳ which Christ hath ordained, it doth but testifie, that he thought not Christ wise enough to preuent such inconueniences, as hee by his wisedome hath prouided for.

Seeing therfore the church cannot forbid that that God commaundeth (whatsoeuer causes they will pretend, and if they might, yet the causes set downe by the Romish church, either are blasphemous, or at the least friuolous) it is a sure way for vs, rather to regard gods holy commaundement, and follow the institution of our sauiour Christ, than to follow any the deuises of man. And when he commandeth, drinke you all of this, it is a great sinne, and deserueth Gods wrath, for any man to answer, I will not receiue the cup, because the Pope and the Popish church of late hath forbidden it.

Heb.10.

Heb.9.1

1.Iohn 2

Against

Against the sacrifice of the Masse, or of the Altar, as they call it.

Chap. 16

THE PROTESTANTS

NOwe to their grosse absurdities, and manifest deprauings of the institution of Christ, they adde also their blasphemies, against the sacrifice of Christ Iesus, which as he was *once offered*, and by that *one offering for sinnes, hath consecrated for euer thē that are sanctified. And hath obtained eternall redemption for vs*: so wee confesse that by that *one* sacrifice *he is the propitiation for our sinnes, which he offered for vs vpō the crosse*, and cannot be dayly offered by the Priest, without great wrong to Christes eternall and onely Priesthood, and without great presumptiō in that priest, that dare offer so excellent a sacrifice, neither without derogatiō to the vertue of his death.

Heb. 10. 10. 14

Heb. 9. 12.

1. Iohn 2. 2.

THE PAPISTS

BVt the Church of Rome teacheth, that in the Masse, the priest (a sinfull man) doth offer vp that most holy sacrifice Iesus Christ vnto God the father, a sacrifice propitiatorie for the quicke and the dead: yea, for the greatest sinnes that wee commit. As for originall sin, they confesse, that Christ hath taken that away by his sacrifice, but our voluntarie sinnes, which therefore also are more odious, must be taken away by this sacrifice, that the priest offereth vpon the Altar: So haue they turned the Sacrament into a sacrifice, Christes holy ordinance into a blasphemous Idoll, and al for their owne gaine, that the Priestes might bee hyred to vse this remedie for the sinnes of the people: this salue for all sores.

The

De Missa. li. 1. cap. 6 Out of Ge. 14. 18

The first argument that Bellarmine hath for proofe of this vnbloudie sacrifice of the Masse, is at large handled by Bellarmine: but the effect of it is this. The thing figured must bee like to the figure: But *Melchisedech*, who was the figure, offered to God bread and wine, as a sacrifice: Therefore also must Christ offer his bodie in forme of bread, and his bloud in forme of wine, for a sacrifice. First, his first proposition is not simplie true, but onely inasmuch as the one must be figured of the other. But in what things Melchisedech is a figure of Christ, none can better tell than the Apostle to the Hebrewes, who fully handleth that matter, and yet doth not once mention this sacrifice. And therefore we may gather, that Melchisedech was no figure of Christ in that point: For if he was, then was not the Apostle faithfull to omit so necessarie a point. Iustin also hath a notable comparison of them, but he doth not touch that in one worde. Secondly, a sacrifice must be offered: but this bread and wine was but brought foorth for so doth their owne translation testifie. Thirdly, a sacrifice must be offered to God: this place mentioneth no such thing, and therefore most likely that it was brought to refresh Abraham, and his souldiers. Whereby we see, that Bellarmines *minor* hath no truth in it, wherein he affirmeth that Melchisedech offred bread and wine to God in sacrifice. Lastly, what a consequence is this: Melchisedech offered to God bread and wine in sacrifice: therefore Christ offered himselfe in forme of bread and wine. Rather is this a strong argument to the contrarie, if wee should graunt that he did offer the bread and wine to God, which hath no probabilitie in it: But I say, if that should be granted, wee might thus reason: The thing figured must bee like to the figure: but Melchisedech who was the figure, offered but bread and wine, therefore Christ offered nothing else but bread and wine: and so maketh it nothing for that sacrifice, for which the Papists doe alledge it.

Bell li. 1. ca. 7. de Missa. Heb. 7.

Col. cum Tryph. fol. 36

As

As for his testimonies out of the fathers, for proofe of Melchisedechs offering of bread and wine to God in sacrifice, because I purpose especially to goe through his generall arguments, I omit of purpose a particular examining of euerie place, onely contenting my selfe with this generall obseruation, that out of the testimonies alledged hee can hardly conclude that which hee taketh in hande to proue, because the fathers seeme rather to allude many times vnto that which he did, than so to alledge his doing, as that they thinke anie necessarie argument for proofe hereof, is to be gathered out of the same. And that may wel be gathered out of Chrysostom vpon this place, who saith thus: For the honor that he shewed to the patriarke, see how a sacrament is insinuated: For he offred to him bread and wine. Marke (to him) that is, to Abraham, flat against that which they would. And this is most agreeable vnto the hystorie written by Iosephus, who by all likelihood knew best in his time how that storie was thē vnderstood, he saith that Melchisedech gaue great intertainment vnto the souldiers of Abraham. And so Chrysostome in the place alledged saith, Abraham brought forth loaues and wine. And thus doth the Chaldee Paraphrase expound it: So that if we rightly consider, not onely what they say, but how they speake it, and vpon what ground, to answer whatsoeuer he can bring out of the fathers concerning this point, will not be hard.

In Gen. hom. 3.

Ant. li. 1. c. 18.

The celebrating of the Passeouer (saith Bellarmine) was an expresse figure of the Eucharist: But, the Passeouer was a kinde of offering of a sacrifice to God: Therefore the Eucharist must so be. Maister Bellarmine hath forgotten what he should proue: hee must teach Christ to be in his last supper a sacrifice properly so called: but this argument proueth the Eucharist to be a kinde of sacrifice.

Argument. 2 de Missa. lib. 1. cap 7.

This argument, to be short, is thus answered: There were two things in the Passeouer: The one was, the killing of it, by which was Christs death represented vnto

vs,

vs, as Iustine Martir that ancient father teacheth, *Dialog. cũ Tryph. Iudæo.* The other was, the eating of it, by which was figured vnto them that spirituall foode of the soule Christ Iesus, who was promised vnto their fathers. And in this respect may it in some sort bee called a figure of the Eucharist, because it represented vnto them that thing, that the Eucharist representeth vnto vs. Therefore, if in the first proposition Bellarmine meaneth by celebrating the Passeouer, the eating of the Passeouer, I graunt it, but then is his *minor* or second proposition vntrue: For the eating of it was not the killing of it, and so not a sacrifice. But if by the celebrating of the Passeouer, he vnderstand the killing of it, then is his *maior* to be denied, because in the Eucharist is no killing, or shedding of bloud. But on the contrarie, a man may thus reason: The celebrating of the Passeouer was not in euerie respect a figure of the Eucharist: For the Passeouer must haue the sprinkling of blood which might not be sprinkled but by the Priest only: as appeareth 2. Chron. 30. 16. where that solemne keeping of the Passeouer, by king Ezechiah is described: and 2. Chron. 35. 11. where it is declared, how zealously Iosiah performed the same seruice. And in that respect onely is it to be counted a Sacrifice: for that onely belonged to the Priests to doe, so as no other but the Priests might doe it. All other things might be, and were performed by others: But the Eucharist they all with full mouth, confesse to bee vnbloodie: and therefore in this thing wherein onely the Paschall Lambe may be accounted a sacrifice, it is no figure of the Eucharist: So the celebrating of the Passeouer, euen in that point wherein it is a sacrifice, doeth nothing proue that sacrifice which the Romish church would teach in the Masse. And see how vnnecessarie an argument this is: In the celebrating of the Passeouer, there was a bloody sacrifice: therefore in the Eucharist must bee a bloodie sacrifice. This consequence the Papists themselues will not graunt: and yet it is as good and necessarie as that of

theirs.

theirs. In celebrating of the Paschall Lambe there was a sacrifice: therefore in the Eucharist there must bee a sacrifice. For this principle that master Bellarmine doeth set downe, That celebrating of the Passeouer, was an expresse figure of the Eucharist: if it proue the Eucharist to haue a sacrifice, it doth also proue it to haue a bloodie sacrifice: for otherwise the Lambe or Passeouer was not an expresse figure of the Eucharist. If therefore the Papists will denie that it is a bloudy sacrifice, why should we grant it to bee a sacrifice, vnlesse they can alledge better reason than this that is taken from celebrating the Passeouer. And thus much for the second argument.

Argument. 3.

The third argument that master Bellarmine bringeth, he sayeth hee neuer read answere to it: and this it is, The blood of the olde Testament. Exod. 24. was the bloud of a sacrifice alreadie slaine and offered: therefore the blood of the new Testament is so: But this blood of the new Testament is the blood of Christ, as himself saith, This is my bloud: therefore he was the sacrifice offered vp in the Supper. It is true, that when Moses said, This is the bloud of the couenant that God hath made with you, the beast for sacrifice was alreadie slaine: but that it must needes be so in the bloud of the newe testament, there is no necessitie, and therefore that argument must bee denied. First, because master Bellarmine maketh the especial thing in this couenant to be, that the bloud was shed before the words were spoken: whereas the principall part in deed is, that the couenant must be established by bloud. And therein Moses directed them to Christ, in whose bloud the couenant of grace is established with Gods people. Which the Apostle to the Hebrews doth rightly consider of, and therefore looketh not to the time wherein the sacrifice was slaine, but to the matter wherby the couenant was established. Secondly, the order which Moses doth vse, and the Apostle obserueth out of him as a verie materiall point, is of vs to be marked. For first, the couenant was

Cap. 8.

Answere

Heb. 9. 18.

made

made betweene God and the people, & then it was ratified by the bloode: euen so because Christ must needs make this couenant, and set downe this his last will and Testament, therefore his bloode-shedding must of necessitie bee after the making of this his last will: so that although that bloode of the old Testament was shedde before the woords were spoken, yet it is not necessarie it should so bee in the newe Testament. Nay, it can not so bee, because hee must make this couenant whilest yet hee was aliue, and no other could make it for him. Then did hee confirme it by his bloode-shedding, which was afterwardes vpon the crosse, whereof that bloode of the olde Testament was but a shadowe. And thus I trust, inst cause appeareth to denie his argument. And then that which followeth, that Christ therefore must be sacrificed in his last supper without anie further labour, falleth to the ground.

De Missa l. 1. cap. 9. As for the fiue sundrie arguments alledged by him in the ninth Chapter of the aforesaide booke, it is no marualle though maister Bellarmine make no great account of the same. For he can not proue out of them, that Christ in his last supper did offer vp his owne bodie to God, and his bloode, in forme of bread and wine. His arguments are taken out of the storie of Hely, the 2. out of the Prouer. 9. 1. 2. The third, out of Esay, 19. 21. The fourth out of Esay, 66. 21. and Ier. 33. 17, 18. the fifth out of Dan. 8, 11, 12, and 12, 11. Read the places who so will, and it shall easily appeare, that they serue not to proue that which Bellarmine would, and therefore I passe them ouer thus hirtly.

Argument. 4 But the mightie argument, the waight whereof will beare downe all before it, is taken out of Malachy. I haue

Mal. 1. 10. no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hostes, neither will
" I accept an offering at your hand. For from the rising of the sunne, vnto the going downe of the same, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in euery place incense shalbe offred vnto my name, and a pure offering, for my name is great among the heathē, saith the Lord of hosts.

Which

Which place to be vnderstood of a sacrifice properly so called, and not of spirituall sacrifices, master Bellarmine will proue by sundry arguments: The first is taken from the Hebrew word which the Prophet vseth there, which master Bellarmine will not in any wise haue to be vsed but for those sacrifices that are properly so called. And yet in this very booke, a little before, he confesseth that sacrifice that is called by the same name, to be But as a part, or as it were the sauce of another sacrifice. And that answer vrgeth them, as he thought, serue his turne, to stop the mouth of Kemnitius. But, now he will haue it, not onely to be a sacrifice, but euen a most proper sacrifice. But by that word, and in that place we are taught, that the sacrifices of Christians shalbe the true sacrifices, not consisting onely of outward shewes, but hauing that inward seasoning and true sincerity, which through Iesus Christ shalbe acceptable vnto God. And that singleness of heart, was signified by that Mincha which was commanded to be offered by the people of God, with their daily sacrifices. Therefore the name proueth not strongly inough the sacrifice for which it is brought. Cap. 6

His second argument is taken out of that worde Cleane sacrifices, wherein he striueth much to proue, that our spirituall sacrifices of prayers, thanksgiuing, yea, of our selues and all our obedience, cannot bee cleane: Wherein although he saith truly of our workes as they are in themselues considered, yet are they also called Cleane: first, in respect of the fountaine of regeneration from whence they proceed, in regard whereof, although they bee not simple cleane, yet in comparison of the workes of them that are secure in their wickednesse they are cleane. Secondly, because God accounteth them as cleane for Christs sake. Thirdly, in respect of that whereunto the workes of the regenerate doe tende: for though they cannot attaine to perfection, yet doe they striue for it. And in this sort Dauid confesseth, some may be Cleane. Who shall climbe vp into the hil of the lord, or who shal stād in his holy place? Why our own workes are called cleane. Psal. 24. 4.

He

Esay 1.16
1. Tim. 2.8

He that hath innocent hands, and a cleane heart. To this Esay exhorteth: Be you cleane. And of this speaketh the Apostle Saint Paule, In euerie place lifting vp pure hands, or cleane hands. And if M. Bellarmine do not content himselfe with this cleannesse, he will find that euen the sacrifice of the Masse it selfe, for which he striueth so in this place, seeing the vertue therof must somewhat depend vpon the goodnesse and deuotion of the Priest (as he saith) will not be found verie cleane, because the sacrificer is manie times verie vncleane. His third reason is taken out of the words that are in the beginning of the text alleaged. Out of which he will proue that it must bee a new sacrifice, and such as was not before: but our spirituall sacrifices haue beene alwayes, therefore the Prophet cannot meane of our spirituall sacrifices. It will neuer be proued that the Prophet speaketh of such a sacrifice as neuer was. But the Iewes trusted too much in their externall Sacrifices: yea, though they were not such as God commaunded that they should be. But on the contrarie, God telleth them, that euen among the Gentiles whom they despised, thinking that no good could be amongst them, I say, among them should be offered, not such polluted and vncleane things, as the Priests were content to take of the Iewes to offer to God, but a Cleane offering: euen such an offering as was the bodie of their shadowes, the truth of their figures, and the substãce of their ceremonies, in respect of him that brought the offering: that is, they should serue the Lord with a sincere and single heart. And this is the cleane sacrifice that Malachie meaneth, which was acceptable alwayes, and alwayes shall be. Fourthly, Bellarmine imagineth, that God by Malachy setteth the contempt and dishonouring of God, done by the Leuiticall Priests against the honour that he shall haue among the Gentiles. Be it so. What then? The Iewes (sayth he) dishonoured God in a visible sacrifice, therefore the Gentiles also must honour him by a visible sacrifice: otherwise the dishonor done by the Iewes,

De Missa li. 2. cap. 4

is

is greater than the honour done by the Gentiles: I denie this consequence: for, they dishonored God but in a corner of the world, but the Gentiles worshipped him from the rising of the Sunne, to the going downe of the same: and herein standeth the force of the comparison, as by the wordes plainely appeareth. Fifthly, he supposeth that the Priestes of the olde lawe, are compared with the Priestes in the Gospel, but there is no such matter, as the wordes declare. But to wring and force wordes, to see what may be gathered out of them, rather than to search what their true meaning is, doth bring but small credite to their cause, and weake proofe to their doctrine. His last argument to prooue this place of Malachie not to belong to a spirituall sacrifice, is out of the fathers, where, in my iudgement hee sheweth his weakenesse, more than in his other reasons, or else a worse humour. For although that Iustinus Martyr whom hee first alledgeth, doeth in trueth affirme, and wee denie it not, that Malachie sayeth that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, yet that hee speaketh not of a sacrifice properly so called, Bellarmine must needes confesse, except he speake agaynst his owne conscience, if hee consider what hee sayeth long after in that booke: namely, that Euerie one that is called by the name of Iesus Christ, are in deede made Priests to God, as God doth testifie, saying: In euerie place cleane and acceptable sacrifices shall bee offered. Which sacrifices also what they are, he afterwards testifieth, prayers and thanks giuings. What can be more plaine? But this especially is to be remembred, that not Priests only, but euery Christian doth by Iustines wordes, offer vp these cleane offerings, and therefore that hee speaketh of spirituall sacrifices. Irene his second witnesse, maketh little for his purpose: for euen immediately before the words whereby Bellarmine would prooue the Eucharist to bee a sacrifice, after the proper signification of the worde, hee sheweth that God hath no delight in sacrifices or burnt offerings, but in Faith, obedience, and righteousnes. And after, that

Col. cum Tryph. Iudæo.

Iren.lib.4. cap.32 he taught his disciples to offer to God the first fruits out of his creatures, not that hee needed any thing, but that they should neither be vnfruitfull, nor vnthankfull. And so he tooke bread, and gaue thanks, and eat, as is by Bellarmine alledged. Can any thing be more plaine? He first sheweth that God regardeth not those reall sacrifices, that I may so terme them: then he sheweth, that the Eucharist is a sacrifice of thankesgiuing. And as in the words alledged by Bellarmine, it is an offering of the first fruits of his gifts, that giueth vs our nourishment, and in the next Cap.33. chapter he expounded the incense (so alledging the words of Malachie, In euerie place incense shalbe offered vp) Apoc.5.8 by that place of the Apocalips, that the incense was the prayer of the Saints: so we see that prayers and praises are Tertul. the sacrifices that he speaketh of, & these are spiritual, and not reall sacrifices. And as for Tertullian whom in the 3. place he bringeth forth: as he hath nothing for him in the Terr.cont. Marcion. li.4 place by him alledged, so yet he plainly expresseth in another place what hee vnderstandeth by that cleane sacrifice Exam. Con. Trid.2. part. that Malachie speaketh of, namely, Sincere praier out of a pure conscience. Which place being alledged by Kemnitius against the councel of Trent, Bellar. to shift it off, as boldly as vntruly, he affirmeth that Tertul. doeth not expound Malachies place, where he nameth the cleane sacrifice, but where he nameth the incense. But the place of Tertullian plainly sheweth the vntruth of his answere: for Tertullian speaketh thus: In euerie place a sacrifice shal be offered in my name, and a cleane sacrifice, euen sincere prayer out of a pure heart. So that Tertullian did not so much as dreame of any incense there: and it is so placed, that it must needes expound how he vnderstandeth that cleane sacrifice spoken of by Malachie. The next commeth in Cyprian, who saieth, That the olde sacrifice is abolished, and the new celebrated: and then (sayeth Bellar-

Ad Quirin. lib.1.ca.16 mine) he citeth this place of Malachie. It is true: but

Esay 1.11.12 Psa. 50.14. 15,23 first he citeth Esay, and the 13. verse of the 50. Psalme, or as he doeth recken it, of the 49. for reiecting of their

externall

externall sacrifices, and then out of the same Psalme hee teacheth, that prayer and prayse are the true sacrifices: and also out of the 4. Psalme, hee speaketh of the sacrifice of righteousnesse. And then followeth that of Malachie. whereby it is most manifest, that Cyprian understandeth by the sacrifice mentioned in Malachie, no other than that which out of the Psalmes he learned. And in all these places, Bellarmines euill dealing is notorious: For hee will not so much as see the wordes that are before his eyes, but onely picketh out that which hee thinketh serueth for the establishing of his errour, and concealeth that which would giue light to the trueth. And it were too tedious to answere to euerie testimonie, especially seeing that which hath beene saide of the places before alledged, doth sufficiently testifie what was the iudgement of the auncient fathers concerning this place of Malachie nowe in question: I will therefore returne to his generall arguments. Psal. 46

Maister Bellarmine his first principall argument, is taken out of saint Iohn. where he sheweth that the true worshippers shall worship in spirit and truth: but this worship must needes be (saieth he) the offering of sacrifices properly so called: Therefore the true worshippers in the daies of Christ shall offer these sacrifices properly so called. But Chrysost. vpon that place can find no such sacrifices, but expoundeth this place by the 12. to the Romans, of our spirituall sacrifices, with whom also Theoph. seemeth to agree. And S. August. thinketh not that this kind of worshipping needeth to be performed in any materiall temple, but that our selues are Gods temple, yea, and that his holy temple, and therefore that this worship must bee in our selues, & therefore spirituall. Hitherto haue we heard some reasons to proue in the Eucharist that there is a sacrifice properly so called, gathered partly of the figures of the old law, of the which I may truly complaine. as S. August. did of the Donatists: You stay (saith he) vpon those dark points, least you should be forced to grant that which is plaine: Argument 5 Ioh. 4. 21. 23 In Iohn Hom. 32 In Iohn Tract. 15. De vnit. Eccl. cap. 19.

plaine: or elſe forced out of ſome other doubtfull ſentences, whereof alſo with the ſame father, againſt the ſame heretikes, I may ſay, Alledge ſomething that needeth no
Cap. 16 interpreter, that cannot be prooued to be ſpoken of ſome other thing, and you indeuour to draw it to your owne meaning. And therefore, out of ſuch vncertaine allegations a certaine concluſion cannot be gathered. But now let vs ſee what is alledged out of the verie inſtitution it ſelfe: for if any thing worth hearing can bee brought out of it, it muſt needs be forcible. Therefore thus he reaſoneth: Chriſt in his laſt ſupper offered himſelfe vnder
Argument 6 Bel. de miſſa li. 4 ca. 12. the forme of bread & wine to God the father, and commaunded that to be done of the Apoſtles, and their ſucceſſors to the end of the world: But this is to offer a ſacrifice, properly and truly ſo called, and to inſtitute that it ſhould be offered: Therefore the Euchariſt is a ſacrifice properly ſo called. For the maior in this argument, wherof all the doubt is, it is a plain fallacie: for he beggeth to haue that confeſſed that is denied, & to haue that granted that is in queſtion. For if he could proue that Chriſt did offer himſelfe in his laſt ſupper to God the father, we would eaſily confeſſe it to be a ſacrifice true and proper. So that on the contrary, I may as well reaſon thus: Chriſt cõmanded nothing to be don, but that which himſelf did in his laſt ſupper: but himſelfe did not ſacrifice: and therfore he commaunded no ſacrifice in the laſt ſupper. Bel, his firſt proof of this vntrue propoſition, is ꝑ which he hath ſaid of Melchiſedech, the paſchal Lambe, & the blood of the couenant, of which I truſt I haue ſpoken ſufficiently, in the iudgement of any indifferẽt man, in my anſwer to his 3. firſt principall arguments. His ſecond reaſon is this: Theſe words,
Luke 22. 19 20 1 Cor. 11. 24 Is giuen, is broken, is ſhed, which are words of the preſent time, do ſignifie that he was giuen, broken, & ſhed vnto god for a ſacrifice. M. Bellar. ſeemeth to me to be hopſhakled, ꝑ he cãnot wel ſtep forward. He hath taken vpõ him to proue out of theſe words, ꝑ chriſt offred his body in his ſupper to his father for a ſacrifice: & how doth he proue it? becauſe the

words

words ſhew that he is giuen, broken and ſhed for a ſacrifice to God: is not this a good leape, thinke you? And yet his propoſition that he ſhould prooue, and his reaſon whereby hee doeth it, are all one. But if hee ſtand vpon theſe wordes, Is giuen, broken, and ſhedde, therefore it is an act that then was done, and therefore done in the Supper: what will hee ſay to their owne tranſlation, which tranſlateth, Shall bee ſhed, in Matthew and Marke, and Luke alſo, and alſo of the bread, This is my bodie, which ſhalbe giuen for you. It ſeemeth when that tranſlation was firſt ſet foorth, that peece of ſcripture was not ſo taken as it is now: but that thoſe words of the ſupper, were taken for a promiſe of that which Chriſt performed the next day, as in truth they were. I but maſter Bellarmine telleth vs, that al theſe readings are good, becauſe there may be a good reaſō of either of them. I confeſſe that to be true: and therfore M. Bellarmins reaſon is not ſtrōg, whoſe force hangeth vpon theſe wordes onely, which may well be tranſlated otherwiſe. But by the way, what if I ſhould thus reaſon? A repreſentatiue ſacrifice is not a protiatorie ſacrifice: but Chriſts ſacrifice that in his ſupper hee offred vnto God, was repreſentatiue, ſaieth Bellarm. in this place, therefore not propitiatorie, and much leſſe then is the Maſſe a propitiatorie ſacrifice: Neither do I ſee to what end Chriſt ſhould repreſent to God the ſheding of his bloud, which ſhould be afterwards vpō the croſſe, although M. Bellar doth ſay it: becauſe he is loth to tell the true reaſon (which I haue alreadie touched) why their cōmon Latin tranſlation did not preciſely follow the Greeke in tranſlating of theſe words, ſhalbe giuē, broken, ſhed. His third reaſon out of the words of the inſtitution to proue his ſacrifice, is as ſtrong as the ſecond, and is this: Breaking cannot be ſpoken wel of the bodie, and in this place (which is broken for you) cannot be true of the bread, for the bread is not broken for vs: therefore it muſt be vnderſtoode of Chriſts bodie in forme of bread. In this argument M. Bellarmine reiecteth their vulgar tranſlation which ſomtime he and his

Math. 26. 28
mar. 14. 24
luk. 22. 20
1. cor. 11. 24

fellowes doe highly extoll, for, that saith, which shalbe deliuered. And so doe Chrysostome, Ierome, Primatius, Theophilact, yea, and Thomas of Aquine also, al of them expounding these very words. And Cyprian in his second booke of Epistles: and so doe our English Remists translate it likewise. Al whose translations do sufficiently proue, that they espied not any such mysterie in that worde, is broken, but that they were bolde to deliuer the verie true sence of it, shalbe deliuered, to signifie that the body of Christ should suffer the torments vpon the crosse, which S. Paul did expresse by the word of breaking. And in that respect doth Thomas of Aquine (who woulde faine haue the Eucharist to be a sacrifice) say it is a Representatiue sacrifice of Christs passiō, by which passion hee gaue his body to death for vs. But whereas Tho. and after him M. Bellarmine would make their Eucharist a representatiue sacrifice: read and peruse who so will the words of the institution, it will not be found that our Sauiour Christ did offer in his last supper any sacrifice to God, but only spoke to the Apostles instructing them in the vse of the sacrament which then he instituted. As for that he reasoneth out of the words of S. Luke because he seemeth to speake of the shedding of the cup, not of the bloud: Matthew and Marke make the matter more plaine, and tell vs that the bloud of Christ is shed. Doth not this wringing & wresting of scriptures, to force them from their true and natural sence, to serue their turne, manifestly argue that it must needs bee a weake tottering building, that is rayled vpon so bad foundations: and that it is but for want of better proofe, that they are faine to scrape together such poore helps: The second argument of M. Bellarmines, to proue a sacrifice by the institution, is this in effect, Christs body & bloud are receiued in the Eucharist, therefore they cannot but be sacrificed. Which argumēt for vs to deny, it is sufficient, seeing that M. Bellarmine himselfe seemeth to inforce this only against them that confesse a real presence in, with, & vnder the bread, and yet deny the sacrifice. But whereas

Epist. 3

1. Cor. 11. lect. 5.

Mat. 26. 28. Mar. 14. 24.

Kemnitius

Kemnitius requireth in a sacrifice 4. properties, wherof he wanteth 3. in the Eucharist, M. Bellar. can finde them al. First the persons that should sacrifice are the priests, who are willed to sacrifice in these words (if ye wil trust Bellar.) Do this. Who would euer haue gathered thus, ꝑ had eies to looke vpon the words of the institution? You must Doe this: ergo you must sacrifice? Yea, Bellar. seemeth in the beginning almost of this chapter, to be half ashamed of this argument, and blameth Caluine and Kemnitius, because they say that with the papists in that place, & those words, To do, is to sacrifice, and therfore it needeth no farther answer. But for the act of sacrificing: it troubleth Bellarmine to finde it out, neither knoweth he howe to distinguish betweene that act, I meane the sacrifice which Christ offered saith he. and other actions in the supper. And yet master Bellarmine is sure, that such a thing there is there, but where to finde it he cannot tell. Is this (thinke you) good dealing for them that should be good guides vnto others, to take vppon them to leade men they knowe not whether themselues? The words for a sacrament are very plaine, but if you would follow with a bloud-hound, you can neuer finde a sacrifice out of those wordes. As for the testimonies that master Bellarmine alleadgeth out of the fathers, they shall haue this answere. The Eucharist is in sundry respectes called a sacrifice, of the fathers, not only because therein we offer the sacrifices of praiers, and thankes giuings, and duties of loue, but also, and that especially, because it is a memoriall of the true sacrifice which Christ offered for vs vpon the crosse: Therefore it is not enough for M. Bellar. to bring them in, saying, that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, which we deny not, but that it is a sacrifice properly so called, which the papists affirme, but cannot proue. A sacrifice.

His 7. generall argument needeth no answer for it is so weak, that euery child may see ꝑ fault of it. For out of those wordes, As they ministred vnto the Lord (speaking of Paul & Barnabas & others) ministring seemeth to be, or may be taken for sacrifycing: ergo it is take there for sacrifycing, Argument. 7. Act. 13. 2.

Lib. 1. de Missa, ca. 13. saith M. Bellar. Iudas seemed to be a true seruant of Christ but was not. And the very children doe know that it is no good argument to say, such a thing may be, therfore it is so.

Argument 8 Rhem. Test. De missa li. 1 cap. 14 But in the tenth Chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinths, which the Papists make their strong bulwarke, maister Bellarmine findeth three arguments. His first argument is this, Euerie altar which in deed is an altar, is builded for offering of sacrifices: But the Lords table after a sort is an altar: therefore it is for offering of sacrifices. We will not striue with master Bellarmine much for this point: for we will confesse that such sacrifices are offered vpon the altar, as maister Bellarmine confesseth the altar to be. The Lordes table (saith he) is a kinde of altar, or an altar after a sort: So we say, that sacrifices after a sort, namely spirituall sacrifices, are offered thereupon. His second reason out of this place, is a lowde lie: For thus hee saith: For the Apostle speaketh plainly, that we that are faithfull, doe so receyue the bodie and blood of the Lord, at the table of the Lord, as the Iewes their sacrifices, or the Gentiles their meates offered to Idols, on their altars or tables. And because hee cannot proue this to bee true, you must trust him of his owne worde, for he bringeth no proofe at all. Let the indifferent reader peruse the place, and marke his false dealing with it. The wordes cited by him, begin at the 14. verse of that Chapter, and continue vnto the 22. the summe whereof is this, as they that consider the place may see: As by participating at the Lords table, you are made partakers of Christ, and ioyned togither, amongst your selues in one bodie, verse 16, 17: so by participating at the table of Idols, you are made partakers of them, and ioyned in fellowship with the Idolaters. But that which he telleth vs, is so plaine in these wordes, cannot be gathered out of them. And this also is a sufficient answere to his thirde argument that hee wringeth out of these wordes. Whereby he will force Saint Paule whether hee will or not, to finde out an offering in the Eucharist,

because

because he saith, they that eate the offrings, are partakers of the altar. Out of which place, as hee cannot probably conclude any thing to proue a sacrifice in the eucharist, so hee plainely proclaimeth, that if it should be proued, that their masse were a sacrifice, yet the priest only is the better for it, because the priest onlie eateth vp all. For, *They that eate the offrings, are partakers of the Altar.*

The second sort of proofes which Bellarmine promised, is gathered out of the fathers. And the first argument of that sort, is drawen from the wordes of sacrifice, sacrificing, offering, oblation and such like. Why the fathers vse thus to speake of the Eucharist, I haue shewed a little before in the answere to his sixte argument. But nowe maister Bellarmine proueth, that a sacrifice may be both commemoratiue, and represent an other thing, as did the sacrifices in the Leuiticall law, and also be a true sacrifice indeede, which is most true: and thereupon concludeth, that this sacrifice representatiue in the eucharist is also a true sacrifice. But this his argument hath no necessarie consequence: for, the Leuiticall sacrifice must needes be a sacrifice truely so called, that by the death of the beast offered vp, and by the shedding of that blood, the death & bloodshedding of Christ, might be the more liuely represented to the faithfull, and more constantly beleeued of them, which thing being in trueth performed, and Christ Iesus the true sacrifice indeede being offered, There remaineth no more sacrifice for sinne.

Lib. 1. de missa cap. 6.

Chap. 15.

Heb. 10. 26.

Moreouer, in those sacrifices, that they might bee knowen to be sacrifices instituted and appointed of God, we see how the thing sacrificed, the manner of sacrificing, and all the circumstances are plainely set downe and commaunded by God: And on the contrary, in this sacrifice which they seeke to maintaine, all things are obscure: not so much as a probable shew of any commaundement, or of any institution of a sacrifice: Therefore the Iewish sacrifice can be no proofe for the sacrifice of the masse, Secondly,

ly, he will proove, that in the eucharist, is not only a representatiue sacrifice, because the fathers speake sometimes of oblations and sacrifices in the plural number, and therefore there are more sacrifices than that one representatiue: but he taketh more paines then he needeth, for we teach that besides the representation of Christs sacrifice, we offer in the Eucharist the sacrifices of prayers, prayses, and such like spirituall oblations.

Thirdly, baptisme, saith hee, is a sacrament representing Christes death, but is not called of any of the fathers, a sacrifice offered to God: therefore the only representation of Christs death and bloudshedding cannot make the Eucharist be called a sacrifice. For baptisme. it representeth vnto vs the efficacy and vertue of Christes death, rather than the death it selfe: So that there is great difference betweene these two sacraments. For the sacrament of the Lords supper representeth the sacrifice it selfe which he vpon the crosse did offer, euen the tormenting and mangling of his body, & the shedding of his bloud. So that there is much more cause why the Eucharist should be called a sacrifice, than baptisme. Fourthly, M. Bellarmine imagineth, that if it were not indeed a very proper sacrifice, we might in the Eucharist say to God truely, I offer to thee this gift, accept Lord this sacrifice. And moreouer he chargeth vs that we doe wholy abstaine from such wordes, and greatly reproue them for vsing of them. And yet in one short praier vsed after the receiuing of the communion with vs, we pray thus, Accept this our sacrifice of praise & thankesgiuing. And after, We offer and present vnto thee o Lord our selues, our soules & bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, & liuely sacrifice to thee. Which wordes doe not only answere the slaunder wherewith he vniustlie chargeth our churches, but also sheweth that well we maie vse those wordes, I offer to thee this gift, accept Lord this sacrifice, although we take not vpon vs to offer Christ really in the Eucharist. As for the hyperbolicall speeches,

which

which the fathers vse sometimes, which is his first reason, we learne thereby rather with howe reuerent an affection we shoulde come to these sacramentes, than what wee shoulde thinke the thinges themselues to be. For howe can it els bee true that Bellarmine himselfe out of the Greeke fathers alleadgeth, that they call it a sacrifice terrible and full of horrour, which cannot be properly verified of the sacrifice propitiatorie which they woulde haue it to bee, for that must needes bee sweete and comfortable vnto vs: in it is only grace and mercy, no horrour, no terrour.

Lastly, because the fathers acknowledge in this sacrifice of the Eucharist, that there is that honor performed, which is due to God only, therefore woulde master Bellarmine conclude, that it must needs be more than a sacrifice of representation. And we doe easily yeeld vnto him, that it is also called a sacrifice, of the fathers, yea & of vs also, in respect of the spirituall sacrifices therein offered. And this yet must be noted, that properly to speake of the Eucharist, it is but a sacrament: But in the respectes aforesaide, it is sometime called, yet vnproperly a sacrifice. But saith master Bellarmine, the fathers make mention of an altar: therefore they also proue thereby that the Eucharist is a sacrifice: for there is no Altar, but in respect of a reall sacrifice. De missa li. cap. 16.

But the first altars were but tables of wood, not altars of stone, such as are now for the popish sacrifice, in these dales commaunded: and these altars of woode they caried about from place to place, as occasion serued: and therfore, although the names of altars be found in the most ancient fathers almost that are, yet popish altars are not thereby proued, neither were there any altars of stone before the time of Siluester, who liued more than three hundred yeares after Christ: For hee first commaunded that stone altars should be made, as their freind Gerson writeth: And therefore as they call it sometime an altar,

so

Lib.4.cont. Floratum. De consecrat. dist.1.cap. Nemo

so sometime they call it a Table, as doeth Clement, who they say was one of the first bishops of Rome, he twice within few wordes mentioneth the Lords Table. If therefore it be a good argument thus to reason: The fathers do sometime mention an altare for the eucharist: therefore they thought it was a sacrifice, for there needeth no altar but for a sacrifice. I am sure this is as good an argument: Somtime they speake of a table for the eucharist as out of Athanasius, Theodoret, Augustine, this Clement, and others, is most plaine: and therefore they thought it not to be a sacrifice, for, there is no sacrifice vpon a table, but onely vpon an altar.

De missa lib. 1.cap.17.

Yet master Bellarmine roueth againe with his vncertaine proofes. The fathers (saieth hee) speake of priests, therefore they will haue a sacrifice in the eucharist. And why may not the fathers vnderstand priests as wee doe in our booke of making of ministers, and in our booke of common prayer, who succeede in the publike ministery in the church the priests of Leui, not in sacrificing, for the sacrifices are ended, but in teaching: for that was also the priests office, and is now the office of them that we sometime call priests. And yet we, although we vse the name, do not alow that popish sacrifice, which Bellarmine would haue. And why then should this be holden for a good argument: The fathers speake sometimes of priests: Therefore the eucharist is a reall sacrifice, or a sacrifice after the proper signification of that word. As for that which hee hath in the eighteenth chapter of that his first booke of the masse, is almost all one with that which hee saide in the fifteenth chapter, and therefore it is answered before.

Leuit.10.11. Deut.17.9. mal.2.7.

Chap.19

But his last proofe, whereby hee will out of the fathers proove a sacrifice, is, as himselfe saith, vnanswerable, vnlesse we do vtterly reiect the fathers. The fathers desire not to be credited against the trueth. They were men, they might erre. Onely Gods word is perfectly true. And therefore, as wee do them no wrong, to trie and examine their

doctrine

doctrine by that rule and square that cannot deceiue: so if it be not agreeable to that word of trueth, wee must rather confesse all men to be liars, than swarue one iote from that perfect way. And therefore it is not absurd, if wee leaue the fathers, when they goe without their guide of Gods written word, or speake without their warrant of Gods infallible trueth. So that although wee are content, to shew how the fathers wrested by them, either must or may be vnderstoode, that by that meanes wee may pull from them that visard of antiquitie & consent of fathers, wherewith they cloke and colour their dangerous and deceitfull heresies, yet we receiue the fathers but as men, and therefore no masters to giue vs new lawes, but yet men of excellent gifts in their time, and alwayes worthy of much reuerence and honour. But yet this is not a good argument: The fathers haue sometime written this, or haue done this: Therefore it is true, or it is good. But let vs view his vnanswerable argument: If the eucharist were not a sacrifice, the fathers would not haue offred the same, for peace, safety, and sundry such things: but they did: therefore it is a sacrifice. Marke howe hee prooueth that they did offer the eucharist for such things. Hee first alleageth Chrysostome in his homilies to the people of Antioch, and then also vpon Mathew, most notably belying that father, as though he spake there of the sacrifice in the eucharist, whereas the first whole Homily is altogether of prayer, and Chrysostome there sheweth, that they pray in deed for the whole world, and for sundry persons: but of standing at the altar, not a word: And therefore master Bellarmine belieth that father. And in the second place, Wee pray first for them that are possessed: the second, for the penitent, &c. Is this good dealing to auouch, that that ancient father saith in those places, that the Eucharist was offered for such things. Other falsifications of these very places I omit, as not much materiall.

How the fathers are to be receiued.

Hom. 79. Hom. 70.

When I heard his great cracke, I imagined this shot would

would haue made a great breach, but it is like to doe no hurt at all. Then, for that which he alleageth out of saint Augustine, that the Eucharist was offered by one for freeing a certaine house from euill spirites. It is true that he reporteth such a thing, and addeth, That hee prayed as earnestly as he could, that that vexation might cease. First, it is not saint Augustine himselfe that doth this, but another: and this fact is not either commended or allowed to be wel done of saint Augustine. But they wil answere, The euill spirits left the house: And therefore the euent prooueth the fact to be good. Not so: but it is an argument of Gods might and mercie, that can and will by euill, or the abuse of good meanes, bring to passe good things. Secondly, it may iustly be doubted, whether saint Augustine did impute this effect vnto that sacrifice that he speaketh of, or the earnest prayers that were made for it. Yea it seemeth rather that he imputeth it vnto the sacrifice of prayer, than any other sacrifice.

De ciuit. Dei lib. 22. cap. 8.

Moreouer it seemeth, that as in the dayes of saint Paul there were that were baptized ouer the dead, either to declare their hope of the resurrection, or to testify their dying vnto sinne, or for such other considerations: so in these dayes of S. Augustine, some, vpon such occasions would celebrate the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, by that assurance and pledge of Gods loue, to stirre vp and confyrme their faith, that with more earnestnesse and faith they might craue Gods helpe. But if maister Bellarmine would haue this to be a catholike doctrine, that hath but one or few examples, he will haue Vincentius Lirinensis flat contrary to him. So that also that is alleaged of the oblation for his mother: it can not bee denied, that there were at that time some such abuses creeping into the church of God, concerning that charitable superstition, that I may so terme it, of prayer for the dead, of the which some had good liking, some liked not. But out of them it is hard to establish a strange doctrine in Gods church, and such as

Confess. li. 9. cap. 12.

Gods

Gods word is not acquainted withall. But euen by that booke of S. Augustine it is plaine, and namely by the next chapter to the place alleadged, that S. Augustine did not once thinke of any propitiatory sacrifice that was in the masse. And I would also desire the indifferent Reader to iudge how litle such matters sauour of the maiestie of that spirit, which is seene in the scriptures. Bellarmines last sort of arguments are drawen from reason: The first is grounded vpon this principle, there is no religion without an externall sacrifice: which is most false, for God when he seeth his people to whom he commanded those external sacrifices, to repose themselues too much vpon them, doeth not onely reiect those sacrifices which himselfe appointed, but also teacheth wherein true religion consists, Isa 1.15, 16. and Mich.6.8. Yea, marke the whole scriptures & it wil appeare, that faith & obedience are the especiall things that god requireth of vs, & that the sacrifices directed therto. His second argument taken from reason is this: The Iewes had such sacrifices: therefore wee must haue them. If this argument be denied, he can neuer proue it. For the Iewes had those ceremonies and rudiments of the world, because they were in their nonage, and Christ was not yet come, and so the reuelation of Christ, was not then so plaine as now it is: therefore they needed those things, but we do not. And moreouer, if these sacrifices were so necessary as they affirme them to be, as that there is no religion without them, & of necessity we must haue them, then were the Apostles to blame, who giuing direction to the Gentiles what were necessary for them, neuer warned thē of this externall sacrifice. For seeing there was not anie such thing plainely set downe in the word of God, it was needefull that it should haue beene signified to them, if any such thing had bin thought necessary. But Bellarm. thus proueth his argument: God hath not abolished al things in his law, as he hath not taken away the commandemēts: therefore he hath not abolished the ceremoniall law.

De missa lib. 1. cap. 20.

Chap. 11.

Galat. 4.3.

Acts 15. 19. 20.

I would maister Bellarmine would haue taken some paines to shew what part of the ceremoniall lawe is continued. But he telleth vs the sacraments are not take away, they are but changed: so the sacrifices must be but changed, not taken away. When hee sheweth what commission hee hath to tell God what he must doe, we will regard his wordes, but vntill that bee shewed, hee must giue vs leaue, to acknowledge all these things in Christ to be perfomed, especially seeing the worde telleth vs not of anie commaundement to change it, or when, how, or into what it should be changed. But I am loath to confute his grosse assertions, and reasonlesse reasons, whereby he seeketh to keepe vs still in bondage to externall things. One or two arguments mo he hath, the one grounded vpon such differences as themselues haue deuised, betweene a sacrament and a sacrifice, the other is the generall consent of the church throughout the world: the first is somewhat touched in the fifteenth chapter, the other is the thing that is in question, whether the true church haue acknowledged it to be a sacrifice, truely so called, and properly.

Now to conclude, seeing in the institution of this sacrament, there is not any sacrifice prescribed as the wordes do teach vs, neither can it be proued by the scriptures, neither can we find any such doctrine vniuersally receiued of the fathers in the purer age of the church: Lastly, seeing the arguments that are brought for defence of it, are so hard and obscure, so forced and wrested, as they are both frō the scriptures & the fathers: let vs rest vpon this foundation, that Christ was once offered, to take away the sinnes of many: Once, I say, and not often, and that being done, He sitteth for euer at the right hand of God. So that either they must deny him to haue a natural body, but so deified, that it may be in many places at one time, as Nestorius the heretike taught: or that hee sitteth not on Gods right hand, against that which in our creede wee acknowledge: or that he hath two bodies, the one in glorie

Heb. 9. 28. Heb. 10. 12

and

and maiestie, with God in heauen, the other shrowded vnder a little cake, the one visible in heauen, the other inuisible in the earth, or else they must confesse, that he cannot be changed into that little peece of bread, that he may so be offered vp to God his father, for a sacrifice in the Eucharist.

Of true and Christian Repentance, and of the Popish sacrament of Penance.

CHAP. 17.

THE PROTESTANTS

WE willingly confesse and carefully teach repentance, that consists of the mortification of the flesh, & the quickening of the spirit, of dying, to, or from sin, & liuing to righteousnesse, of putting off the olde man, the body of sinne, and putting on the new man, which after God is created in holinesse and righteousnes, to be most necessary for euery christian man and woman, alwayes, and earnestly to follow and practise. And whilest wee must walke here

THE PAPISTS

BVt the Papists not content with this plaine and pure doctrine, to purchase estimation and gaine to the Popish priesthoode, haue deuised a sacrament of penance, whose parts are contrition (which we make one part of true repentance) Confession, not to God, but in the eares of the priest, of al thy sinnes, which hath not any warrant at all in the word, and satisfaction, which is nothing else but a blasphemous wrong, vnto that satisfactiō that is made vnto God by Christ his death. Of the which three partes of

Contrition

Confession.

Satisfaction.

THE PROTESTANTS

here in this wicked world, where we meet with manye stumbling blockes, whereat we stumble, and many pits into the which we fal. It is impossible we should goe on forward to the end of our iorny, vnles by tru repentance proceeding from a liuely faith, & a true sense and feeling of Gods wrath against sinne, and a hearty detestation of our owne vnthankfulnes, to our good and gratious god, we be raised vp again to walke in his wayes, & to liue in his true feare. So that wee finde it to bee true that *Tertull.* saith, *Wee are borne onely to repentance.* Wee stand alwaies so much in neede thereof through sinne.

THE PAPISTS

Popish penance, Confession must be made vnto the priest, and Satisfaction must by the Priest be inioyned after Confession or shrift. By which meanes: they did bring into miserable bondage, them, whose faults they knew, and that they might by masses & trentals, and such other deuises of man, helpe them to satisfie for their sins, they gote no small gaine. And from these two fountaines pride and greedines, did spring this their sacrament of popish penance.

Of arguments whereby they defend this their sacramēt of penance they haue no great store, and those they aledge, haue no great strength. Their especiall, and in a manner onely place that they aledge out of the scripture, is, wherein it is said, that Christ did breathe vpon his disciples, and said to them, Receiue the holy ghost, whose sins you remit, they are remitted to them, whose-soeuer sins you retaine, they are retained. For vpon this place doth the councell of Trent especially rely for this their doctrine, as do also their other writers. Belike this place is very pregnant and plaine for their purpose, or else their cause is built vpon a weake foundation. Let vs therefore view the strength of this place, for proofe thereof for the

Ioh. 20. 22, 23

Sess. 14. c. 5.

which

which it is brought. This text must proue that penance is a sacrament properly so called, for to this end it is alleaged by Bellarmine. But how it is proued, let the indifferent Reader iudge. And first, if we consider the expositions of the ancient Fathers of the purer times, we shal see that they neuer gathered out of these woordes such a sacrament. Read and search who will the commentaries and expositions of the most ancient Fathers, Cyril, Chrysostome, Augustine, Theophilact, and others, they shal not finde that any of them haue out of this place taught the sacrament of penance. The woords themselues teach vs, that God hath giuen vnto his church authoritie and power to preach forgiuenes of sins, to them that are of a contrite and broken heart, and the danger of sin to the impenitent, as Peter Lombard himself one of the first establishers of this Popish sacrament confesseth, saying, that God hath giuen to the Priests power To binde and loose, that is, to shew that they are bound or losed. Which is agreeable to that that S. Luke of our sauiour Christ saith, that repentance and remission of sins, should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Ierusalem. As for any particular reckoning vp of sins, which they call Confession auricular or priuat in the eare of the Priest, without which secret Confession, saith Andradius, This diuine sacrament could not long haue beene kept: or as for Satisfaction that should be wrought for our sinnes by vs or our meanes, these things can not bee gathered out of the woordes alleadged. Nay, if that authoritie committed to the ministery whereof saint Mathew and S. Iohn speake, be to be expounded by the woords of saint Luke, as I haue shewed that Peter Lombard doth, Popish shrift and satisfaction are quite ouerthrowen thereby, seeing that this losing is the preaching of the forgiuenesse of sins in the name of Christ, that is, not for any Satisfaction that wee can make, but in respect of that Satisfaction that Christ hath wrought. It is therefore a wonder to see how boldly and

De sacram.

Lib. 4. dist. 18. Non autem.

Luc. 24. 47.

Orthod. explic. lib. 8. pag. 638.

Matt. 16. 19. Ioh. 20. 23.

confidently out of this Text they will auouch, that out of these wordes are plainly proued the actes of the absolued, that is Confession, and Satisfaction, which must needs be in him that is loosed to be from his sins. Is this to preach forgiuenesse in the name of Christ? Secondly, I finde not in the primitiue church any such doctrine of that their sacrament of penance, as nowe is taught. In deede they required Confession, but especially to God, as throughout the auncient fathers wee may see, and namely in Tertullian his booke of repentance, which is by the Papists violently drawne in to bee a witnesse for them, but can say nothing that will doe them good in this cause.

Bellar. de pœnitent. lib. 1. ca. 10.

And although the fathers doe also sometime allowe of Confession to man, and that priuately: yet did they neuer teach such necessitie therof, as that without it sinnes might not bee forgiuen, or that the mortall sinnes (for those onely must bee reckoned in Christ) cannot bee forgiuen, vnlesse the Priest haue them declared vnto him. Marke the writings of the Fathers, howe farre vnlike they are to the bookes of our Popish Cleargie, and Romish writers in our dayes. Tertullian, Ambrose, Augustine, and others, haue made whole bookes of this title *De pœnitentia*, of penance, or repentance. Chrysostome also hath made of that matter eleuen Homilies: yet out of these auntient fathers this Popish doctrine of the sacrament of Penance cannot bee proued, but that the teachers thereof, are forced here and there to get some peeces of sentences to make some shewe of proofe. And this verie shadowe of proofe is good enough to deceiue the ignorant and such as delight in darkenesse, as the likenesse of men made of stone or other stuffe, set vpon the toppes of castels and holdes, make the enemie in the night afraide, for they think they are all men in deed, which in the day when they may bee viewed, doe easily shew what they are, namely stockes or stones.

stones. If Saint Ambrose had knowen any such Sacrament, might not he, writing two bookes of that matter, I meane of repentance, especially against the Nouatians who denied vnto such as offended after baptisme, any hope of pardō, although they repēted, might not he (I say) haue had from that sacrament of the church, if the church had then knowen any such sacrament, a strong and vnanswerable argument against Nouatus or his followers, for denying a Sacrament of the church: yes verily. But he vsed no such argument, because there was not then any such Sacrament. Nay, the matter was not agreed vpon many hundreth yeares after Saint Ambrose his time. For, as it appeareth by Gratian, who liued about the yeare one thousand one hundred and fiftie, the matter was not then agreed vpon, but there were many and diuerse opinions, whether confession and satisfaction were necessary for this Sacrament, some affirming, others denying it, and Gratian saith that on both opinions there were wise and godly men, and therefore hee leaueth it indifferent. Which could not haue beene, if that their Sacrament of penaunce, had before beene perfected. Therefore as Andradius doth truelie gather out of that historie of auricular confession banished out of the Church of Constantinople by Nectarius, for a villanie committed by him that was appointed to heare confessions, that therefore they were vsed of olde, (although most fallie he teacheth that it beganne with the christian church: and as vntruelie applieth it against Kemnitius, who denieth not but secret confession hath of olde beene vsed, but not, as in the popish church) so if it were a thing to bee forbidden by man, we maie boldely saie, it was not ordained by God: but by man it was abolished, as appeareth by the ecclesiasticall history.

de pœn. dist. 1. c. quamuis.

Orthod. expl. li. 8. pag. 663.

And whereas Andradius saith, that the sacrament of penance began with the christian church, Socrates in that place is directlie against him, who telleth vs that it

Socrat li. 5. cap. 19.

beganne after Nouatus his hereſie was publiſhed, which was about the yeare of our Lorde 220. For becauſe the Nouatians would not communicate with them that denied their profeſſion in the perſecution raiſed by Decius, the biſhops therefore agreed amongſt themſelues, and appointed ſome one to whom they might acknowledge their ſins. So that heere we ſee againſt Andradius, that that confeſſion which being viewed is not like the popiſh ſhrifte, is more then 200 hundred yeares yonger then the Chriſtian church. Moreouer, as of al other ſacraments, ſo of this alſo the papiſts teach that it doth giue grace, and worke that grace that it doth ſignifie, which grace is then when the outward ſigne is vſed, powred by God into them that receiue the ſaid ſigne. In which reſpect, as I take it, is that groſſe abſurdity ſet downe by Roffenſis, That a ſinner commeth oftentimes with faith, and without grace to the ſacrament, who aſſone as hee hath receiued the ſacrament both he and his faith by grace are quickned. To ſay nothing of this popiſh paradox and far from al true taſte of chriſtian diuinity (that a man may haue faith and no grace, whereas in truth faith is Gods gift and that of his eſpeciall grace) we ſee what vertue the papiſts doe attribute vnto this ſacrament, as they doe call it, and yet Peter Lombard their owne friend, (out of the prieſts office concerning leapers, who did only iudge whether they were cleane or foule, but hee coulde not make them leapers or not leapers, doth appoint alſo thoſe limites vnto the prieſts concerning binding or looſing, or rather ſheweth, that ſuch is their authority, not that they can make any ſinners, or vaide of ſinne, (which leſſon he learned out of Hierom) but only to iudge whether they were ſinners or not. By which he learneth, and plainely ſaith euen in this cauſe, that God doth not alwaies follow the iudgement of the church: And therefore god doth not alwaies binde or looſe, as the church doth in her conſiſtory. Is not this flatly to deny vnto this their ſacrament, that working ver-

Bellar. li. 1. de pœnit. cap. 10.

Artic. 10. cont. Lutherum.

Li. ſentent. 4. diſt. 18. Leuit. 13.

vpon Matth. 16

tue

tue and power which the papistes giue to it? Or rather is not this to deny it to be a sacrament, seeing it is denied not only by Saint Hierom, but also by a deare friend of theirs Peter Lombard, that it hath such vertue as they ascribe to their Sacraments? And heere their answere of the vnworthines of him that receiueth this Sacrament, whereby he hindereth this worke of the Sacrament, will not serue. For we see that the iudgement of the church by their opinion doth only shew what men are, and according to it doth binde or loose, but it doth not make them good or bad. And therefore Chrisostome in an homily of repentance, Trust not (saith he) vnto thy repentance, for thy repentaunce is not able to take away so great sinnes. Hom. 8. ad populum Antioch. Now therefore we see, that neither the testimonie of the fathers, in their commentaries vpon this place, neither the words themselues, if we looke vpon their naturall meaning, neither yet the practise of the church, for more then 1100. yeares, after Christ, can make these words to proue any sacrament of penance, which the papists so boldly without all proofe thrust vpon vs. For I pray you, where is the outward signe of this sacrament? Are these words, I absolue thee, &c? But where are these words commanded? Bellarmine hath found them in these words, Whose sinnes you remit, are remitted, &c. Concil. Triden. Sess. 14. cap. 3. And how doth hee proue it? Because the Lord would neuer grant vnto his Apostles power to forgiue sinnes, but he would haue that power exercised by some externall signe, for these are his words. We grant it, and for that cause hee hath appointed the ministery of the gospell: but the promises are generall, and whether they publikely, or priuately, are to be vsed to the comforte of the afflicted, we finde not in the scripture any set forme set downe for absolution: and therefore in the scriptures they cã neuer find that outward signe which is required in a sacrament. And therefore it seemeth that Bellarmine scarcely dareth to defend that which the councell of Trent hath taught, concerning the forme of this their sacrament. For de paenit. li. 1. cap. 10.

l. 1. de pœn. cap. 16. the councell of Trent saith, that these wordes are the forme of their Sacrament of penance. But master Bellarmine saith, we are not tied to those wordes, but that these words, I remit thee thy sinnes, will also serue the turne. For this matter let them agree amongst themselues. But they must shew vs some outwarde signe appointed by Christ for this Sacrament, or els we must denie it to be a Sacrament. And that they haue laboured to doe these many yeares, and yet they cannot doe it. But M. Bellarmine striueth earnestly to proue that place, whose sinnes so euer you remit, they are remitted, not to be spokē of baptisme. We will ease him of some labour, we will graunt that it is not spoken only of that remission, that therein is done. Man is like a ruinous house, that must alwaies be repaired by repentance. We haue alwaies need to pray, forgiue vs our trespasses. Chrisostome pretily compareth sinne in man, to an oake tree, which he that will cut it downe, must strike not once, or twise only, but often, yea he must neuer leaue vntill it fall. So must we flie alwaies to this remedy, not only once, or twise, but ten thousands of times, if so often we offend, yea alwaies. The comfort of this promise therefore, we will in no wise restraine to the time of our baptisme only: but we confesse that that forgiuenesse of sinnes, which in our baptisme is sealed vp vnto vs, hath force and vertue, through our whole life: and thereby are we assured, that this promise of the forgiuenes of our sinnes, and remitting of the same is most certaine and true, and belongeth to our whole life, and to euery sinne that we commit.

Hom. 3. de pœnitentia.

Now this forgiuenes say (the papists) must be applied vnto vs by the sacrament of penaunce. They should proue that: for in matters of religion their credite is not so good that we dare trust them. And the lesse wee trust them in this matter, because we are sure that God hath giuen vnto vs other meanes to apply his mercy vnto vs, namely his word: for applying whereof vnto our consciences, hee hath ap-

appointed his ministery in his church. Yea, he hath giuen his word to be read and knowne of euery bodie. Then also hath he giuen vs Sacraments, to confirme vs in this word, and to make vs more confidently to beleeue it, and more faithfully to receiue it. These therefore are the meanes whereby our faith is nourished, and made more bolde and strong, to apply to our humbled hartes those comfortable promises of Gods good graces, which in the words are offered, and by baptisme, and the supper of the Lord are sealed vp in our consciences. Nowe, other Sacramentes we know not, and namelie this of penance. Neither is there any necessarie consequence in this argument: These wordes are spoken of remission of sinnes, after baptisme: therefore there must needes bee a Sacrament of penance. And that should bee proued. And therefore to grant him that, which hee so striueth for, will doe him no good. After this one place that Bellarmine hath out of the Scriptures, he commeth to the fathers; who because they affoorde him no plaine proofe, he indeuoureth to wring something from them by indirect meanes. The proofe therefore that he hath from them, as himselfe professeth, is either because that when they reckon vp the true Sacramentes, they often make mention of repentance also, or els they compare it with the sacrament of baptisme, shewing that it is God that worketh in them both. Had it not bin better to yeeld vnto the truth, then thus before hee proueth any thing out of the fathers to proclaime the weakenes of his proofe? For is not this a weake argument: The fathers in reckoning vp the sacraments do often also make mention of penance: therefore it is a sacramẽt. Or this: baptisme & repẽtãce are many times cõpared togither, but the one is a sacramẽt properly so called: therefore also the other must so be? I trust the weaknes of that argument is easie to spie out, seeing the fathers may in diuers respects speak of the sacraments, other than of their sacramentall nature, or of those things which they seeme to match with the sacra-

De pœnit. li. 1. cap. 10.

craments in speech, not minding to make any mo sacraments, than Christ left vnto the church: therefore so long as his arguments are but coniectures, euen by his owne confession, it is but lost labour to bestow any more time thereupon. Therefore, although we confesse that our whole life should be a continuall profiting in the doctrine of repentaunce, and the practise thereof, yet the sacrament of penãce we iustly reiect, because neither the scripture nor most ancient fathers, yeeld any plaine testimony thereof.

Of lawfully calling into the ministerie, and against the Sacrament of Order, as they call it.

CHAP. 18

THE PROTESTANTS.

THat in the Church of Christ there ought to bee a lawfull calling vnto the ministery, we so willingly confesse, that wee take it to bee one of the especiall graces of God, towards vs who are heere in this vale of misery, for the which we are bounde to thanke God, day and night. For as their office is to *Gather togither the Saintes, to worke in the ministerie, and build vp the body*

Eph.4.12.

THE PAPISTS.

BVt the church of Rome not contented to haue the fruit and benefite of this ministery, which Christ gaue to his church, doe (although without all warrant of Gods worde) make a sacrament thereof. Or rather of this one they make seuen sacraments: for all their seuen orders haue seuerall ceremonies, yea and by their owne confession seuerall graces also, which they doe worke & so in steed of seuen sacraments

Eph.4.11.

2.Cor.5

verse.18.

Rom.8.7.

1.Cor.2.1

Es.52.7.

1.Tim.5.17.

THE PROTESTANTS

dy of Christ. Yea as *Ambassadours for Christ to intreat the world to bee reconciled vnto god*, and therefore it is well called the *ministery of reconciliation*, than the which there cannot be any greater benefit whilst we are compassed about with the burden of this flesh, whose will is stubborne and cannot be subdued to the will of God, whose wisdome is but folly and blindnes, and *perceiueth not the things of the spirit of God*: so the more wee are assured that they are appointed of God vnto the said ministery, and to labor in the said office, with so much the more diligence wee will heare them, with the greater reuerence wee will receiue them, and with the greater readinesse, wee will obey them. And such as in some measure indeuour to performe this dutie, we reuerence as Ambassadours from that greate God, *Their feete are verie beutifull vnto vs*, we account them *worthy of double*

2. Cor. 5. 20.

verse, 18.

Rom. 8. 7.

1. Cor. 2. 14.

Es. 52. 7.

1. Tim. 5. 17.

THE PAPISTS

mentes which themselues speake of, they recken vp thirteene, namely sixe beside their sacrament of order, & seuen in it. And whereas the ministery was appointed for preaching and ministring the sacramentes, and they who laboured most in the word did best performe the same, they haue turned teaching and preaching, into sacrificing and lisping. So that it is great commendation for one of their prieستes to lyft faire: As they that could but kill a Rumme or a Calfe, were prieستes good enough for that rebellious people of Israel, who yet called themselues Gods people. As for reuerence and honor they content not themselues with that regarde, that is due to their ministery and office, no neither yet that the Pope shoulde so much excell the Emperour, as the Suune doth the Moone, that is 47. times or degrees to be better than the emperour, as their own canonists teach, but that blasphemous papist. Staniſl. Orichouius did *offer vnto the councel of Trent a booke,*

Concilium Trident. sess. 23. Can. 1.

Innoc. de Maior & obed. c. sol. & glos. ibidem.

In sua chimæra fol. 97. 98.

where-

double honor. The godly will (howsoeuer the world despise thē) obey them as their fathers, solow them as their guides, hear them as their teachers, and loue thē *as helpers of their ioyes*. knowing that they cānot despise thē, but that they despise also God that sent thē, & their own saluation for which they are sent.

2. Cor. 1. 24.

wherin he makes euery priest better than a king, in authority, degree, place. & waight yea he saith, that the priest is another God of the kings excellency. That the king is but a creature, but the priest a creator: and how much God is better thā a priest, so much is a priest better thā a king: yea so much better is the priest than a king, as a man is better than a beast. And yet these horrible blasphemies are allowed of with them.

These grosse absurdities being thus euen by their owne bookes proclamed vnto the world, I might say to our Papists, as S. Hierom did to the Pelagians, To lay forth your opinions, is to confute you. Your blasphemie is euē at the first very manifest: there is no need to refell that which is of itselfe blasphemous: Yet for the satisfaction of the ignorant, it is not amisse to lay open the principall grounds whereupon this their sacrament is built. It hath (say they) all those things which are of necessitie required in a sacrament: namely, the outward signe, the promise of inward grace, and lastly, the commaundement, or Gods institution. The outward signe they made to be imposition of hands: for so saith Bell. And yet afterwards being better aduised, considering also that euen some of his owne friends, thinke that laying on of handes is but an accidentall thing vnto this sacrament, and that the very necessary matter of this sacrament, is the cup with wine, and the couer thereof with bread, (for then is it said to them, Receiue power to offer a sacrifice, when these things are deliuered) he affirmeth that not only the giuing to thē of these things, but also the laying on of hands, is the matter or visible forme of this

Ad Ctesiphontem.

Bellar. lib. 1 de sacra. Ord. Chap. 2. Ibidem.

Cap. 9.

this sacrament. Whereby we learn that themselues are not well resolued as yet, what shall bee the externall signe in this sacrament. For in deed that which Christ did when hee ordained ministers, that externall signe (I say) they make small account of: for he Breathing on them said, receiue ye the holy Ghost. Whereby Christ would teach (as saint Augustine thinketh) that the holy Ghost proceedeth from the father and the sonne also. And no maruell if they vrge not that ceremonie: for Christ himselfe is not verie curious in that point. And as himselfe did not commaund that ceremonie to bee vsed: so neither did himselfe practise it any more but that once, as may appeare in sundrie places, where hee authorizeth his Apostles to preach without breathing vpon them. And nowe, for laying on of handes, which many times the Apostles vsed, wee haue not only the testimonie of many in the popish church, that thinke it not to be the principall outward signe in this sacrament, but thinke the giuing of a chalice with wine, and the couer of it with bread, to be more essentiall and effectuall: but also we see that there is no commaundement giuen to the Apostles for it, and therefore neither doe they commaund it to be vsed, as a thing so necessarie that it may not be omitted. And whereas we acknowledge this ceremonie to haue sundrie vses: first in respect of the church, the partie ordained is by that ceremonie notified vnto the church: secondly, he is confirmed thereby in his calling, put in minde of his dutie, and assured of his vocation by this common approbation, that hereby the church sheweth. Thirdly, thereby the church doeth testifie, as it were before God, their sincere dealing in their election, and consecrate him to the seruice of God. Lastly, the Godly vsed manie times in praying for others, to lay their hands vpon them. Bellarmine in the place aboue named bestoweth some paines, to proue that praier and laying on of hands are two distinct things, which is not denied. To be short, the summe of his argument is this: it was vsed of the Apostles, there-

John 20.
Tract. in John. 121

Mat. 28. 19
Mar. 16. 15
Mar. 10. 6, 7

fore

fore it is so necessarie that it cannot be omitted. We answer that that ceremonie had good vses, but yet might be omitted. Because our saviour Christ did neither vse it nor commaund it. And to thinke that be omitted anie substantial point of religion, or that the Apostles would account as simply necessary any thing not vsed or prescribed by Christ, is to absurd. And whereas they proue the promise of iustifying grace to be made by Christ, vnto them that receyue this their sacrament of Orders, I wonder that they see not, how ꝑ both many are iustified that neuer entered into their Orders, & many also that haue had, and haue their greasing and scraping, are as wicked men, and so by likelihood as far from this iustifying grace as Turkes or Iewes. And so it easily appeareth, that this second thing required in a sacrament, namely that it should seale in vs the promise of iustification, hath not so much as anie likelihoode, to bee in this their sacrament of Orders. The third thing necessarie in a sacrament is Gods commaundement, wherin they confesse their want, and that they haue no commaundement. But yet because God did giue grace with laying on of the Apostles handes, therefore they take it as commaunded of God. If this bee a good argument: God gaue good successe to it: therefore it is commaunded of God, many strange partes in Sampson, Iehu, and others, will proue to be commaunded of God: but that is most false, as the Papists themselues will confesse. God did not onely prosper Phinehas, in that which he attempted against Zimrie, and Cosby, but commended the fact also, and graciously rewarded the same, but yet he had no commaundement for so doing. Therefore although God may bee saide in some sort to like of that to which he giueth good successe, yet no man can thereby conclude, that God hath commaunded it: But rather on the contrary, we may thus reason. The laying on of hands was neither practised by our saviour Christ, neither commaunded by him or his Apostles; therefore that ceremonie is not of

1 Tim. 4. Bellar. de ord. sacra. li. 1. ca. 2.

Numb. 25

of such necessitie, but that ordination may bee without it. Yea but Christ is not tyed to the sacrament (sayth master Bellarmine) and therefore can giue the effect of the sacrament without the sacrament; hee can make Priestes without laying on of handes. That hee can so doe, wee confesse, but that hee dealeth so in the institution of sacraments, all the Papists in the worlde will neuer bee able to proue: for in them we see that all things are most plaine, the outward signe, the promise, the commaundement, nothing in them hidden, nothing doubtfull. But because himselfe dare not well rest vpon that answere, hee concludeth that seconde chapter with another aunswere, for hee telleth vs, that it may bee that Christ did lay his hands vpon them whom he made ministers. Is this good dealing? Doeth not this manifestly bewray the weakenesse of their cause, when such friuolous coniectures are the chiefe strength of their cause? As for the Fathers whatsoeuer out of them they doe alledge, cannot prooue that which they take in hande: namely, that the sacrament of Orders is a sacrament like to Baptisme and the Eucharist. For all men must confesse, that these two sacraments, which wee acknowledge to be common to all Christians, are farre vnlike in that point to that popish sacrament, which belongeth but vnto a fewe.

Cap. 2. li. 1.

And euen in this consisteth especially the true vse of Baptisme, and of the Eucharist, that they should be genenerall testifications vnto the whole church of Gods graces, and seales of his promises, and pledges of his loue and fauour. And therefore the fathers sometime call Ordination a sacrament, yet it followeth not, that they take it to bee a sacrament in the proper sense, but in that sense onely as they call manie other things Sacraments, which the Popish Church doeth not receyue as Sacraments. But (say they) the Fathers compare Ordination with Baptisme. For Bellarmine maketh

De Sacram. ord. lib. 1. c. 3

great

great reckoning of that argument. The fathers may bo so in some respect, because the sacrament of Baptisme cannot be reiterated: no more must he that is once ordained to the ministerie, seeke to be ordayned againe for euerie action that he performeth in his ministerie, but hee is once for all appointed thereto. But what is that to the nature of the sacrament, which must by a visible signe assure vs of inuisible graces. So that, although Ordination be like to Baptisme, after a sort, yet is it not like to Baptisme, in that it by a visible signe doeth assure vs of inuisible graces: but onely, because it is not to bee reiterated no more than Baptisme is. And thus wee see the weakenesse of this argument: Ordination is in some poynt like to Baptisme: therefore it is a sacrament in such sort as Baptisme is. Thus then, I trust it appeareth howe weakely they proue Ordination to be a sacrament, who haue neither scriptures, nor fathers for the same. But if they
Matt.28.19 could proove that Ordination which Christ vsed to bee a sacrament, what is that to Popish Ordination? Christ sent the Apostles to preach, Goe teach all nations: but by their ordination the popish priests Receiue power to offer a sacrifice. The Apostles executed their commission which Christ gaue them, as appeareth in the Acts and their Epistles. And the popish priests on the other side thinke there is no seruice any thing so pleasing to God, as the offering of sacrifices. We see then, that as Ordination, euen as Christ and his Apostles vsed it, is not a sacrament properly so called: so popish Ordination is nothing but a meere prophanation of Christs order, and a wilfull breach of his commaundement, and therefore most vnworthie of the name of a Sacrament.

Of Matrimonie, that it is not a Sacrament, and that it is lawfull for all men.

Chap. 19

THE PROTESTANTS.

MArriage wee confesse to be in it selfe an estate, holy and honourable, and for all sortes of vs most necessary, considering that men and women of all callings and conditions, are subiect to noysom and filthy lusts, wee dare not therefore forbid it to any sort of men or wome, lest we should seem to reiect that remedy that God prouided against sinne, or to refuse the helper that he made for vs, or to lay a stumbling blocke before men or women whereat they might fall.

THE PAPISTS.

THe Papistes not content with that accoũt of matrimonie that the Scriptures doe make, will needes haue It to become of the fiue Sacraments, which they haue added to the two that were instituted by Christ: And yet straitway, as if they had forgotten themselues, they doe thinke it to bee too base an estate, too vnpure and vncleane for any man for to liue in, that is called to minister before the Lorde. And And therefore their priestes must not bee married in any wise.

That matrimony is not a sacrament, speaking of a sacrament properly, as when wee call baptisme or the supper of the Lord sacraments, it is most plaine: First, because the things that are required in a sacrament, are not to bee found in it, namely, an outward signe, a promise of iustifying grace, Gods institution or commandement. As for the commaundement, some would wring it out of these

Matth. 19.6. wordes, That which God hath ioyned together, let no man put asunder. But that is onely a prohibition, that man shal not loose that knot which God hath knit, there is no sacrament commaunded. And master Bellarmine spying that fault, dareth not commend their indeuor therein, but taketh another course. For he thinketh his friends troubled themselues more than they needed, to be too curious, in searching where it is commanded to be made a sacrament. But if Gods commandement, or the institution of the sacrament be necessarily required in a sacrament (as Master Bellarmine hath often shewed) the Papists (by his leaue) shall either shew, when, and how, it was instituted to be a sacrament, or else there is no cause that we should trust them, although they al had sworne, that it is one. For in truth this their doctrine is so doubtful & vncertaine, that themselues know not what to say of it. For, some thinke that it hath alwayes bin a sacrament, euen from the beginning of the worlde: but Bellarmine wil not in any wise agree to that. And the councel of Trent is flat of that mind, that it is a sacrament instituted by Christ, and therfore not of the old law. If then it be true, that matrimony was not a sacrament vntil Christ made it one, it is needful that they should prooue, that Christ hath made it a sacrament, before we can receiue it for one. And this reason is very strong against master Bellarmine, who reasoneth against them that think that matrimony was a sacrament of the old law, because, It is not read (saith he) that there was any institution of marriage in al the olde testament: he meaneth after mans fall. Therefore, if they proove no institution of it, they proove no Sacrament. Nowe for the second point. For to proove it to be an outward signe they bring those wordes of Saint Paule. This is a great sacrament (for so the old translation hath) but the word signifieth also a mysterie or secret. But wee will not contend of the worde. Will they imagine that this word can proove matrimony to be a sacrament? Wee see, that Christ and his

De sacram. matrimon. lib. 1. cap. 2.

De sacram. matrimon. lib. 1. cap. 5 sess. 24. can. 2.

Ioh. 5. 32.

apostles

Apostles are more carefull of the true vse of the Sacraments, than of their names, as may appeare by those two Sacraments which we acknowledge, which are not so much as named sacraments. Secondly, to proue it to be a sacrament, it is not enough to shew that it is a signe of a holy thing, but that it was instituted to bee such a signe. And that can they neuer doe in this. For it was instituted in paradise, where it was no such signe as themselues confesse, as is shewed, yea Bellarmine denieth that there is in matrimony any outward signe by the institution of it. So that although it represent vnto vs (to our vnspeakeable comfort) the vnion and coniunction, betweene Christ and his church, yet that it was not instituted to that end, & that it is not an outward signe by the institution of it, it is most plaine. But how will they proue the third thing, namely the promise of saluation to be in this their sacrament? For sooth because it representeth vnto vs the spirituall loue of Christ to his church, & hir obedience to him againe. That is also performed in euery body of mã or womã, if we marke the vnion betweene the members and the head. In euery fine tree, yea in euery plant, if wee consider the coherence betweene the branches and the tree. Yea many such things there are that haue as much in thẽ belonging to a sacramẽt as matrimony hath. And yet howsoeuer they may be vnto vs, if we cõsider of thẽ as we may do, I neuer heard or read that euer they were accõpted sacramẽts in the proper sence. And why? because God neuer appointed them to that end. For in the sacramẽts Christs institutiõ is the especial thing, how little account so euer M. Bellar. make of it. The 2. argument whereby I proue matrimony not to be a sacramẽt is, because that many of the scholemen, who are the especial friends to those popish sacraments, doubt whether matrimonie giueth grace, which the popish church doth attribute to all sacraments. For as Canus reporteth: the Ma. of sentences, Thomas of Aquine, Scot, Bonauenture, Rich. de S. victore, Paludanus, Durand & others do not define,

Sacr. mat. li. 1. cap. 5.

De locis Theol. li. 8. cap. 3.

whether it giue grace or not, but leaue it to euery mans owne opinion. As for the matter or forme of this sacrament (to vse Canus his words) these schoolemen do shew themselues so inconstant and wauering, so vncertaine and doubtfull, that he shoulde but proue himselfe a foole, that in such difference and disagreement, would set downe any thing for certaine or true. And for that cause the Councell of Florence (saith he) decreed nothing of the matter, forme, or minister of this sacrament, because it saw, that the Diuines in the schooles had concluded nothing of them. Seeing therfore themselues within so few yeares doubted, yea and are not yet fully resolued, whether that sacrament giue grace, without the which it cannot bee a sacrament in the Popish church: they giue vs iust cause to suspect, nay flatly to affirme, that it was not a sacrament instituted by Christ. For if it had, before this time doubtlesse themselues at the least woulde haue resolued of such principall points thereof. And if Christ did not institute it a sacrament, then also we may deny it at all to bee a sacrament: For neither men nor angels may institute any sacraments (as Bellarmine hath truely noted). Neither are they yet agreed, whether euery marriage is this their sacrament. For Canus in the place before alleaged, thinketh not any matrimony to be this sacrament, but that onely that is solemnized by the Priest. But Bellarmine with all the skill he hath opposeth himselfe against him, yea, it is high time he should so do. For hee plainely confesseth, that if that opinion of Canus be true, then they shall neuer out of the scriptures or councels bee able to proue the sacrament of matrimony.

De sacram. Matrim. lib. 1. cap. 3.

De sacram. Matrim. lib. 1. cap. 7

Then wee see it standeth him vpon to doe what he can: For, either must the marriages not solemnized by the Priests, bee this sacrament (and so euery man and woman is a minister in this sacrament) which his own friends will in no wise graunt vnto him: or else matrimony is not a sacrament. And then they haue deceiued the world some hun-

hundreds of yeeres. Thirdly, matrimony can not be a sacrament, because the promise of grace is common vnto all sorts of men and women. And therfore the sacraments and signes also of those graces should belong vnto all sortes. But in the Popish church matrimony is denied to some sortes, as to their clergie: Therefore, by their owne doctrine it can not be a Sacrament, especially such a Sacrament as baptisme and the eucharist, for they are common to all sortes: but matrimony (they say) must not so be. And this is the second point of their doctrine which must be examined. For it seemeth to mee very strange, that they, who haue nowe so magnified this estate of life, that it must be no lesse than a holy sacrament, doe so sodainely debase the same, that they thinke it not pure enough for their owne and annointed creatures. But I looke that they should come against mee with an answere out of maister Bellarmine, that their Priestes in deede are forbidden to marry, but not in that respect that it is a sacrament, but because of those things that followe marriage, and are impediments and lets to them in their calling. And yet neither all the consequents of marriage are denied to their clergie: For maister Bellarmine telleth vs there, that if a man and wife being married together will promise continencie, they may well enough take their orders, and are truely both married folkes and priests. So that not cares or troubles that are incident vnto married folkes oftentimes, are any thing to bee respected in this case. For clergy men may haue all these, but the especiall duety of marriage they may not performe. Whereby the Papists to defend the credit of this their sacrament, doe robbe the Clergie of that thing which is the especiall representation of the coniunction of Christ and of his church; whilest they would make these beleeue, that the performance of the duety betweene man and wife, is a thing not to be suffered in Clergie men.

marriage lawfull for all men.

De sacram. matrim. ca. 5

The very ground of this assertion of maister Bellar-

mines, is that hee thinketh not the copulation of maried folke to bee of the substaunce of Matrimonie. And this he prooueth by some testimonies out of the fathers in that fift Chapter. But yet himselfe will not, that this his saying should bee so vnderstoode, as if that hee sayd, that the vse of marriage is not any way of the substaunce of mar-
Chap.6 riage. For afterwardes hee sayeth, that this their sacrament may haue two respects. As it is made, and as it is continued. As it made, that is, (if I be not deceyued) as the mutuall consent of parties ioyneth them together by their promises, the consent expressed by such wordes, is the matter and forme of their sacrament. And thus must wee vnderstand that common rule in their lawe, that consent maketh marriages. And thus doe the fathers vnderstand that which they say concerning the substaunce of marriage to consist in the mutuall consent: partly, because after such consent giuen, the parties are not free to chaunge
Deu.22,23 24 the choyse which they haue made: And partly because that euen by Gods lawe, if parties after such consent giuen, shoulde carnally knowe another, it was death for them so to doe: which could not bee, but because this their consent is after a sort the marriage it selfe. This, if it represent any thing to vs, doeth but represent that ioyning of
Chap.5 Christ with vs by spirituall loue, as Bellarmine himselfe confesseth. But that is not any speciall benefite, or singular: For hee loueth all his creatures, and wept for the destruction of his enemies: And one man may be so ioyned with another. But it is a speciall grace, that marriage representeth vnto vs: to vs (I say) that after a peculiar manner belong to him. Namely, howe wee are made flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones, howe our bodies are the members of Christs bodie, howe in deed hee is, as in name hee is called, God with vs. This is represented vnto vs, but by that copulation that is betweene man and wife, whereby, as before by consent they were of one minde, so nowe by it they are one bodie. For

by

by copulation the wife is made one bodie with her husbande. And this doe I take to bee confessed by maister Bellarmine himselfe, when hee telleth vs that in the seconde respect by Matrimonie, is meant that which continueth. And then must the bodyes of them that are maryed needes be the matter of this sacrament, euen their copulation and dwelling togither. And therefore he alloweth well of the iudgement of Peter Soto, that thinketh euen this vse of Matrimonie to bee the matter, not onely about which this Sacrament is occupyed, but of which it is made or consisteth. If then it bee the matter of their Sacrament, which they denie to their Cleargie, it is not true that maister Bellarmine saide, that they denie not their Cleargie men to marrie, as marriage is a sacrament. For they deny that to them which is the substance of their sacrament.

This may also appeare by the definition of matrimonie, which we may finde in the fathers. Marriage (sayeth Clemens of Alexandria) is the first lawfull ioyning together of man and woman, for the procreation of children. And Tertullian is inquisitiue what is marriage before God, and findeth it to bee when God ioyneth together two into one flesh. Then if we wil speake properly of marriage, it is the ioyning together, not of minds, or heartes onely, but of bodies also. Yea, and it is confessed by maister Bellarmine, that such marriages as haue not copulation, are but a maimed and vnperfect Sacrament, and that Priestes may so be married. And howe his fellowes will take this at his handes, I cannot tell: that they who count themselues most perfect, should not bee admitted but to that vnperfect Sacrament, whereas the common sort, and knowne sinners, might bee partakers of the perfect Sacrament. But let them order those matters amongest themselues. But saint Basil perchance would admit them to the vse of marriage, since maister Bellar. doth permit them to marry, so that they abstaine frō

Strom. 2. li. De Monog.

li. 1. chap. 5 De Sacram. matrim.

De vera Virginitate.

the vse of it. For (saith he) since the reason of the minde directing, hath manifestly ioined their hearts in respect of some necessitie, worthily doth the vnitie of bodies, to which they are knit, folow those hearts so vnited: wherin this lerned father seemeth to me to be of that mind, that there is no cause, but that whosoeuer may in heart be ioined vnto another as to his wife, may also in bodie bee ioyned with her. And so if it be lawfull for them to marry, and to Cap. 5. continue married, as Bellarmine confesseth, it is also lawfull for them to haue the vse of marriage, as saint Basill here saieth. But what is the reason why they stande so much in this matter? Are they not men? haue they not infirmities? Can they who this day finde themselues to be voyde of such assaults, as are the fruites of wanton lusts, promise to themselues that they shall bee so to morrowe likewise, and so to continue also? Let no man deceiue himselfe in that foolish imagination: no body can assure themselues of anie such thing, it is a rare gift of God. Mat. 19. 11 1. Cor. 7. 7 All men cannot receiue this thing, but they to whome it is giuen. If it be a gift of God, as Bellar. confesseth, it is 17 De monac. li. 2. cap. 31 too much presumption for vs to be so bold to promise it, as though it were within our owne reach. If it bee care, it is too much wickednesse, and too great occasion of offence, for the church of Rome to require it, so as they doe of all their cleargie. Yea, but they teach this as a doctrine De Cler. li. 1 cap. 21 that needes must bee beleeued, and with a full consent, and namely Bellarmine, That they haue the gift of continencie that will. And againe, That there is no man that cannot liue continently, if himselfe will. Of this doctrine of free will I shall God willing speake more largely hereafter. But now for this bolde and grosse affirmation, I am verily perswaded, that it neuer could haue come from any man, vnlesse either his minde were blinded with ignorance, that hee saw not the trueth of his owne estate, or his heart were either possessed with such a senselesnesse that it could feele no sinne, or else so bent to resist the truth,

truth, that he would not yeeld to it, although hee knewe it. For what can bee found in the scriptures more common, than the falles of the godly, the faults of Gods seruants, their complaints, their sighes, yea, their teares, because of their sinnes? Shall we say, they sinned willingly, or that they walked not carefully in their wayes? S. Paul then will proue vs to be liars, who for his part doth testifie, To will is present with me, but I finde no way to performe that which is good. For I doe not the good thing which I would, but the euill which I would not, that doe I. Wher see, saint Paule would faine not haue done euill, but yet hee did it. Shall wee say, we are stronger than hee was? Then are wee fooles, and knowe nothing of our owne weakenesse. For this cause Paule willeth the yonger widowes, not to bowe chastitie, or striue for it, but to marrie, and doe such duties. Yea, and if the scriptures should not teach vs this, let vs but looke into our selues, and considering indifferently, and without partiality, how subiect we are to sinne, we must confesse, that if the Apostle had cause to sigh, wee may iustly tremble and quake for feare. If hee complaine and mourne, wee may in bitternesse and anguish of soule crie out: for his weakenesse shall bee founde strength, if it bee compared with our readinesse to fall. And yet I confesse, that God will giue grace to them that aske it, and let them that seek find, so that they aske and seeke in such sort as they ought to doe, and such things as are necessarie for them, to walke in their calling. But to aske, that we should not stand in need of that helpe and remedie against sinne, that God hath prouided, or that wee should liue a more angellicall life, than hee hath appointed vs to doe, is to tempt God in asking without our warrant, and therefore without fayth, and to despise that measure of grace that God hath vouchsafe to bestowe vpon vs. The treasure is great that wee who are Gods ministers doe carrie, although in earthen vessels, that the power might bee of God, and

Rom. 7. 18. 19.

1. Tim. 5. 14.

2. Cor. 4. 7.

not

not of vs. It is inough for vs if the Lord keepe vs so of his great goodnesse from falling, that we bee not dashed in peeces, and bee a reproch to this excellent worde of life. So that wee honour him, and glorifie his name, in what estate of life so euer it be, whether single life, or mariage, it maketh no matter. Gods will be done, and Gods name be prayed for it. Well then we see beggers must be no choosers, but looke what hee hath appointed vs to haue, let vs bee heartily thankefull for it, and craue Gods good spirite to direct vs in that way.

Seeing then it appeareth, I trust, that neither to liue vnmaried without burning in lust, is in our power, neither yet it is needfull that anie should striue for that, vnlesse hee see that God hath giuen him that gift, let vs yet further consider, what it is that they so much mislike in mariage. They say, that it doeth open a doore vnto wantonnesse, and putteth fire to all lustes: And as Pope Siricius sayeth: for such to marrie is nothing else, but to liue in the flesh, yea, in pollution, and that they cannot please God. Yea, blasphemously doe the Iesuites of Colen call it the life of Sardanapalus for a Priest to marrie. But more like to the saying of a plaine Atheist, is that saying of that man of Colen, that a man were better to haue a hundred harlots, one after another, than one wife. And our countrey man Doctour Smith, in his booke of vowes and single life, is not ashamed to affirme, that it is a lesse sinne for one that hath made a vow, to take to himselfe a harlot, then to marrie, we heare his impudencie: let vs heare what reason hee hath for him. If hee commit whoredome (sayeth hee) hauing vowed chastitie, he is at his libertie when he will to reforme his life, and to change it into a chast life. What man can doe in such case as I haue sayde before. But if they bee married, can they not also abstaine from the vse of marriage vpon iust causes? Hath not the Apostle giuen plaine order, what shall bee done in that case? Doeth the Apostle giue com-

Cens. col. diall. 3 Ad Himer.

Censur. col. dial. 3.

D. Smith Obiection 8

commaundement, yea or counsell either, that men and 1 Cor.7.5.
women shoulde bowe, that they may bee the more free
to serue God? No, but the contrarie rather. For al-
though hee Suppose that it is good for the present ne- 1 Cor.7.26
cessitie, that a man should continue a single life, whi-
lest afflictions and great daungers did oppresse those first
dayes of Christ his church, and they had no safetie to
themselues, so that care for their wiues and children,
might withdrawe them from their holie obedience and
patient profession: yet notwithstanding hee woulde to a- 1 Cor.7.2
uoyde fornication, that euery man shoulde haue his
wife, and euerie woman her owne husbande, marke
euerie man, euerie woman, none excepted. And againe:
But if they cannot abstaine, let them marrie: for it is
better to marrie than to burne. Doeth the Apostle open
the doore vnto wantonnesse in permitting marriage to all,
excepting none? Yea, and that men should not be too rash
in making their vowes in this case, hee willeth that such
as are married, defraude not one another, no not to giue
themselues to fasting and prayer, but onely for a time,
and so to come together againe, least Sathan shoulde
tempt them for their incontinencie.

And for single life it is commended by the Apostle no
further, then whilest a man standeth firme in his owne
heart that he hath no neede, but hath power ouer his
owne will. And it is worth the marking, howe Smith
here, and also all the Papists almost in this poynt, doe
so directly oppose themselues vnto the Apostles doc-
trine, as if they had swoorne to giue him the lye in his
throte. For whereas hee sayeth of all, of all (I say)
and not of laie men onely, It is better to marrie than
to burne, this doting doctour Smith sayth, and so do his
fellowes: it is better for a priest, not to burne onely, but
euen to commit whoredome, than to marrie. It is better
to haue a hundred harlots, (sayeth another) than only one
lawfull wife. Lawfull (I say) because that howsoeuer

some

some filthy men, condemne in some, that holy institution, yet Gods word doth not only suffer and also commend it, but euen command it to all that cannot liue without it, but that they must burne in lust. And Ciprian doth plainelie permit it vnto them whom we call Nunnes, saying, that if they will not, or cannot continue (in virginity) it is better that they should marry, than that by their wantonnes they should fall into the fire. Which words, because they are very flatte against the popish doctrine of vowes, the papists doe striue to finde some plaister for that wound. And amongst others, Bellarmine (liking nothing of that which Hosius, and others haue saide before him of this place, of Ciprian) imagineth that he hath hit the naile vpon the head. His answer is, that yet whilst they are free, and haue made no vow, if they see they cannot continue, Ciprian saith, it is best for them to marry. But that maister Bellarmine hath as far missed the cushion, as others before him haue done: and that his answere is most vntrue, I proue, first by the question which was moued vnto Ciprian. For Pomponius to whom he writeth, did aske of Ciprian, what hee should thinke of some women, who had professed virginity, and yet were founde in bed with men. So that if he answere directly to Pomponius his question, he sheweth what should be done, with such as had already vowed, and not of such as were to make the vow. Secondly, in the very words next before, it doth most plainelie appeare, that he maketh two sorts of such as haue made the vow, the one sort he would haue to continue, namely such as though faith haue yeelded themselues to Christ: the other of them that will not, or cannot. Thirdly, that which followeth, that to excuse themselues they would offer to bee tried by women, whether they were virgins, (for vnto that their excuse Ciprian maketh answere) is so strong an argument, as maister Bellarmine, and all his friends, will neuer be able to answere, to proue that those words of Ciprians are not ment, neither can be vnderstood, of such as

Epist. li. 1. ep. 11.

de Monach. li. 1. cap. 34.

stood

stood in doubt, whether they would vow or not, as master Bellarmine affirmeth, but of such as after their vow, neither would, nor could persevere in their purpose. For if that only had beene their doubt, whether they could continue virgins, that matter the women could not iudge of. If whether they were virgins, it is directly against master Bellarmines answere to this place. It is not therefore to giue occasion of wantonnes, to teach mariage to be lawfull for all men, as without shame they affirme, as by the holie Apostle and that learned father appeareth; but they that condemne it, doe let loose the raines vnto all vncleanenes, as saith Saint Bernard, and they that forbid mariage vnto some sorts, doe sow the bad seed of vngodly life, and wanton lusts, the fruit whereof hath defiled the whole worlde. But what? Is it forbidden by God himselfe? They know not well how to answere to this question. For the Maister of Sentences, for ought that I see, hath said nothing of that matter. And he is their very oracle, who, if he hold his peace, they know not what to thinke of the matter. But Iohn Maior, Clichtouæus and some others, doe affirme that this single life is commanded by God himselfe. But Thomas, whom for the most part master Bellarmine is deuoted vnto, and sundry others doe plainlie saie, that God hath giuen no law concerning single life. And that master Bellarmine doth not only allow, but proueth it so to be, with whom we are alls willing to ioine. For it is most true that there is not one such commandement in all the scripture, neither yet is it necessarie that priestes should liue a single life, or vnmaried, both which things master Bellarmine hath in that place. If God then haue not commanded it, neither the thing is necessary, let master Bellarmine bring what els he can to proue it, he shall not much trouble vs about his vnnecessary precepts. But the Apostle (saith he) hath commanded it. A bishop must be continent. Although continent and chaste is in truth all one thing, yet master Bellarmine will not thinke it sufficient that a bishop

Super cant. serm. 66.

De clericis. li. 1. cap. 18.

De cler. li. 1. cap. 19. Tit. 1. 8.

shoulde

should be chaste because he knoweth that Saint Augustine and other of the fathers affirme that there is chastity in mariage, but he will doubtles spie some greater vertue in continency then in chastity, and therefore he will haue a bishop not chast only, but also continent. But if we must seeke for a difference betweene these two wordes, I take this to be it, that continencie is of shorter continuance, that is to say, but an abstinence for a time, and chastitie is a vertue that indureth. And the examples brought by master Bellarmine himselfe approue this difference. But Chrisostome and Theophilact, doe take continencie to be an abstinence not from lusts only, but from al vice, so that as Theophilact saith, he must rule his tongue, his handes, and his eies. Hierom vpon these wordes saith plainelie, that the Apostle neuer speaketh of continencie or incontinencie, but in respect of wanton lustes, but yet he taketh continencie, to be such a vertue, as may be in maried folke. And therefore the Apostle (saith he) hauing spoken of a bishop, that hee may haue one wife, least he should seeme to permit incontinencie, to them addeth this: and with Hierom agreeth Primasius. So that they make continent, and chaste, all one. For although married folke must performe the duties of mariage one to another, yet so, as they passe not the bounds of chastitie or continencie. This reason then is not good. Priests must by Saint Paules rule bee continent, therefore they must haue no wiues. But on the contrarie. Saint Paul in that verie place, where he requireth in a bishop continencie, doth permit at the least, that he shoulde be the husband of one wife, therefore in mariage there may be continencie. As for that which hee alleadgeth out of Councels, popes, fathers and reason, because they proue not that which hee hath vndertaken to proue, it is not worth an answere. For the title of that Chapter is, That single life by the Apostolicke law is verie well tyed to the holie orders. And when hee hath snatched at one poore worde, and findeth no greate

1. Cor. 7. 3. 4. 5.

Ti. 1. 6.

Chap. 19.

helpe

helpe in it, hee seeketh to proove by Councels, popes, fathers and reason, that single life hath beene commended of some, commaunded of others. But that the Apostles commaunded it, hee prooueth not, and that hee tooke in hande. But on the contrarie, the Canons that are called the Apostles, haue this Canon: Let not a bishop or Priest put awaie his wife, vnder pretence of religion. If hee doe it, let him bee excommunicated, if hee stande in it, let him bee reiected. But what saith master Bellarmine to this? he answereth out of one Humbert a Cardinall, that to put away his wife, is to haue no care of his wife. But if we marke the fiftieth Canon of the Apostles wherein there is a prouiso, that none shoulde abstaine from mariage because hee thinketh it to bee euill, it will eassilie appeare, that that first Canon was made, to ouerthwart the foolish opinion of them, that condemned mariage as a thing more vncleane, then that it should be fit for priestes or bishops. And thus much to proue, that mariage of priestes is not euill of it selfe, or vnlawfull in respect of any commandement in Gods word. Now that it is also lawfull, I am perswaded by these reasons. First, because of the vncertainety of the contrarie doctrine: for some say, that sole life is commanded by God, others denie it as you haue heard. Againe there are, and those papists too, that say the lawe of abstaining from mariage, for the clergie was first made by pope Siricius, who liued almost four hundred yeares after Christ, although Iohn Faber report that Calixtus forbad it somewhat before. But Bellarmine and others thinke in no wise that it may be suffered, that this their doctrine shoulde bee thought so farre shorte of the times of Christ, and his Apostles.

Can. 6.

de cler. li. 2. cap. 22.

Fab. Tract. 4. in Luth. de mat. clear.

Some holde it a necessarie lawe, others but conuenient. And such diuersitie of doctrine in these and such like pointes is, if not an inuincible, yet a verie probable proofe that their doctrine hath no sure grounde in Gods word, no great consent of antiquitie, and that is the

Bellarm. li. 1. de clericis, cap. 18.

cause

cause that there is no certaine doctrine of it amongest themselues, and such is their agreement also concerning that other point, whether matrimony be a sacrament or not. Secondly, the weakenes of their proofe, doth euen proclaime vnto the world, the weakenes of their cause. For the most and best learned of them doe confesse that God hath not commanded it. And the proofes that they bring out of the Apostle for it, as it seemeth, haue so little waight in them, that Bellarmine is ashamed to alleadge them. As for that shall holde that he could get out of the Apostles
Tit. 1.8. words, That a bishop should be continent, how little it can helpe his cause, you haue heard before. Seeing therfore that either they bring nothing worth hearing out of Gods word, or apply vnto the clergy only, that which the Apostle speaketh to all men and weomen indifferently, (such is all that they alleadge out of the 7. Chapter of S. Paules first epistle to the Corinthes) we are the lesse bound to beleeue, whatsoeuer they out of the fathers shall teach vs concerning this matter. Who themselues doe charge vs to examine by the scriptures their writings, and not to beleeue any thing that they shall teach, vnlesse they teach such things as are agreeable vnto Gods word. Yea, since their arguments are so weake, that euen Panormitane and other papists whom Iohn Faber in some respects spareth to name, because they saw no necessary consequence in them (although they liued in daies of greater darckenes than wee do (God be praised for our light) indeuoured to obtain, that mariage might be lawful for the clergy. as Faber reporteth:
Cont. Luth. Tract. 4. yea and pope Pius the second was so little moued by those arguments, that he had wont to say, that there was great
Plat. in the life of Pius. 2. cause that priests should be forbidden to marry, but greater, that mariage should be permitted vnto them: and the Ambassadours of catholicke princes were earnest suiters, in the names of their princes to the councell of Trent, that mariage might be free for the clergy. Since these arguments (I say) were not able to perswade these men so deuoted to

their

their doctrines, as it is knowen they were, how much more may we reiect this their lawe, as hurtfull to Gods church, and iniurious to our wise Law-maker, and suspect it not to rest vpon good ground. Thirdly, the most blasphemous commendation that they giue vnto this estate of life, and the efficacie and vertue, that impudently and vntruely they do ascribe vnto the same, maketh me thinke it is but a bird of their owne clecking, and that therein they seeke rather their owne praise than Gods glory. Because thereby they teach men to looke for remission of sinnes, and make it a thing meritorious: and so they robbe Christ of his honour, and take from him his office, to attribute the same to the obseruation of their vngodly lawe. And vnto this reason which is taken from the euil fruit of their wicked doctrine, I might also adde the lower grape of vngodly life that followed the same. Which made not Papists onely, but euen the Pope himselfe to wish the abolishing of that cruel lawe, and the remouing of that dangerous stumbling blocke, as before you haue heard of Pius, the second pope of that name. Nowe besides these wants that wee finde in the contrary doctrine which may induce vs to see the vnlikelihoode of the same, wee haue also the first institution wherein it was saide to all without exception, Increase and multiplie. Then also wee haue that generall aduise and counsell wherein the apostle aduiseth all men and women, that it is better to marry than to burne: which aduise the apostle giueth in respect of that common experience wherein wee finde it to be true that euery man can not attaine to the gift of chastitie in single life. Thirdly, wee haue also particular direction for bishops by name, so permitting marriage vnto them, that no man can doubt therof, vnlesse hee wilfully winke for feare he should see the light of the trueth. Fourthly, we haue the practise of the priests in the olde lawe, who were married, although they had the daily sacrifice to offer morning and euening. Almost all the apostles, and many bishops of the Primitiue

Genes. 1. 28.

1. Cor. 7. 9.

1. Tim. 3. 2. Tit. 1. 6.

church also, if they will trust Vicelius their owne friend, were married men. Therefore we may conclude, that for the clergie, as for other it is lawfull, that euery man haue his owne wife, and euery woman her own husband. Whereupon it also followeth, that not only the Montanists, Maniches, Encratians, Martionists, or such like, who did wholy condemne marriage, or at the least much mislike the same, but also the papists who doe accompt it too impure for their clergie men, are amongst the number of them of whom the spirit speaketh euidentlie, that in the latter daies some shal departe from the faith and shall giue heede to the spirits of error, and doctrines of deuils, who haue their consciences burned with a hote iron, forbidding to marry. For although others may perchaunce in that point be worse, yet that proueth not that they cannot be euill. And although the fathers doe expound this place, of those heretickes that were before or in their time, yet is that no barre to vs, but that we may in like maner confute thereby all them, who doe in any sort condemne matrimony. But they saie they condemne not matrimonie, neither force men to single life. Whether they haue drawen men to their vowes or not, let the world iudge. But it is but a shift to saie, they denie not mariage. They deny it to that whole estate, in so much as in Queene Maries time, we haue seene the clergy forced, either to leaue their function and ministery, or to forsake their wiues. So that although they say not to any man or woman particularly, thou shalt in no wise marry, yet they deny it to that estate of life, which needs must be in the worlde, as not holy enough for them, wherein if they were well examined, they would be found to conspire with those auncient heretickes.

1.Tim.4.1. 2.3.

Bellarm. de cler. li. 1. cap. 20.

Of

Of Anoiling or extreme Vnction, that it is not a Sacrament.

Chap. 20

The Protestants

WE willingly confesse, that the Apostles of our Sauiour Christ, *Annointed many that were sicke with oile: and healed them.* And that saint *Iames* confesseth, that *if any be sicke, they shoulde send for the Elders; who shoulde pray for him, and annoint him with oyle in the name of the Lord.* By the which visible signe God did testifie to men of that gift of healing that he indued his church withall, vntill by such myracles he had confirmed the gospel, and assured mens consciences of the power of his word. But that it was instituted for a sacramēt we cannot acknowledge. And much lesse can we yeelde vnto that popish anoiling that it can bee called a Sacrament properly, or yet be tollerated in Christ his church, it is so contrary to the Apostles practise.

Mar. 6. 13

Iam. 5. 14.

The Papists

For without any warrant of the word, they consecrate their oile, which the apostles did not, for any thing we can reade. Secondly, the church of Rome doth appoint what partes shal be annointed, as the eies, eares, nose, lippes, handes, feete, and the reines of the backe. But yet they are not agreed, that all these are of the essence of anoiling. And indeede Bellar. *in respect of honestie, supposeth that women shuld not be anointed on their reins. But Laurence Vaus, would haue men anointed in the back & womē on the belly, so far hath he forgotten all honesty. But thapostls were not curious in these matters. Thirdly popish anoiling must not be vsed but when all hope of life is past: the apostls vsed oile whē they hoped to heale men of their infirmities. The apostles vsed oile for all diseases, Popish anoiling was but for some.*

De vnct. c. 10

In his catechisme.

Bellarm. de vnctione lib. 1. cap. 2.

Other differences also might be found, but these few are sufficient to shew, that the church of Rome hath added to the word of God, and practise of the Apostles in this point: and therefore, if that were graunted vnto them, which they can not proove, namely, that that which the Apostles did, was a sacrament: yet can it in no wise followe, that the Popish anoyling can bee a Sacrament, vnto the which they haue added so many, yea, and some of them so vnseemely ceremonies. And yet the councell of Trent is not ashamed to affirme, that the church of Rome doeth obserue none other thing as belonging vnto the substaunce of this sacrament, than that which saint Iames hath prescribed: Where did saint Iames appoint that the oile shoulde be consecrated: for, that it shoulde be consecrated, it is as master Bellarmine doth terme it, of the essence of the matter of this sacrament, and not accidentary.

Sess. 14. ca. 3 de sacram. vnct.

De vnct. lib. 1. cap. 7.

Master Bellarmines shift that hee hath for to answere this demaund, is too bolde and shamelesse, and doth more lay open the badnesse of their cause. For hee saieth, that it is enough for them, if saint Iames doe not forbid it. And is that your touchstone (M. Bellarmine) whereby you will trie your doctrines? What will you say then to that Lawe that God hath established for euer. Whatsoeuer I commaund you to doe, doe it. Thou shalt put nothing thereto, nor take aught there-from. Which, as it is true in all matters of religion, so especially in the Sacraments, wee must take heede, lest in adding any thing to them, wee change thereby the vse of them. In this thing, if in any, is that true that Tertulhan hath said, It is forbidden that is not frankely permitted. And that also that in an other place he hath, The Scripture forbiddeth whatsoeuer it noteth not. Secondly, master Bellarmine thinketh it to bee a thing belonging vnto the substance of the Sacrament, that the partes wherein the fiue senses are, shoulde bee annointed, that is, the eies, the

Deut. 12. 32. and 4. 2.

de Coron. Mil.

de Monog.

the eares, the nose, the lippes and the handes. Then let the councell of Trent shew this commaunded by saint Iames, but that can neuer be performed: so that wee see that bolde affirmation of the councell of Trent, was rather, to blind the eies of men, vnder a shew of good words, seeking thereby to make the world beleeue, that they adde no materiall point vnto that which saint Iames commaundeth: and that is most false, as hath beene shewed, and might also further be proued. For, where is that forme commaunded by Saint Iames, that is prescribed by the councell of Trent. By this holie ointment, &c. He hath no minde of any such matter. Besides this their adding to that which saint Iames hath willed to be done, (which is but a small matter with the church of Rome, for all their religion wherein wee differ from them, is nothing else but additions to Gods worde) their owne diuersitie of opinions concerning this their sacrament, doeth shew it to be a deuise of their owne: for they knowe not what to say for the institution of it. They haue not so much as any shew or colour that it was instituted by Christ, or before his death, but onely that place of saint Marke, where it is saide, that the Apostles annointed many that had infirmities, and healed them. And therefore Thomas Walden, Alfonsus, and others, doe seeke for the institution of the sacrament out of that place.

Sess. 14. ca. 1. de sacr. vnct.

Mar. 6. 13.

But maister Bellarmine seeing what danger may come to their sacrament, if they should seeme to make that the ground of their sacrament, because sundry of the auncient fathers seeme to make that vnction that saint Iames speaketh of, to be none other, but that which saint Marke mentioned: hee seeketh to prouide a plaister for that sore. And he will not in any sort haue those wordes to bee the ground or institution of the Sacrament. And for that cause hee prooueth by many reasons, that they are not all one. For hee seeth that it can not be denied, and therefore himselfe graunteth, that that vnction which the A-

De sacr. vnct. cap. 1.

postles in that first chapter are saide to vse, was onely or especially for bodily diseases, and therefore that the sacrament cannot bee prooued out of it: for the sacraments as there he also confesseth, are belonging principally to the soule. Therefore hee will in no wise like of them that alleadge this place of saint Marke for this their sacrament, although they bee many, yea, and those great pillers of Poperie, and no small fooles I warrant you: But such as Eckius, the Scotish man Nicoll Burne, the prouinciall Councell called Senonense, yea, and the Councell of Trent, although it set it downe somewhat fearefullie, (for it saith it was insinuated by our Lorde Christ in Saint Marke) all these with others (I say) establish their sacrament of Unction, and ground it vpon that place: yet Bellarmine (as I haue sayde) will not in any wise yeeld vnto it. And for my part I thinke hee saieth truely, when hee sayeth it is not grounded vpon that place.

Decret 10. De Sacram. vnct. sess. 14. cap. 1.

And as truly also if hee should affirme, that it hath no warrant out of that place of saint Iames. For that place of saint Marke, and that other of saint Iames, speake both of one sort of annointing, as Beda, Theophilact. and Oecumenius doe testifie. But saint Markes wordes can not proue the sacrament of Unction, as maister Bellarmine doeth not confesse onely, but hee taketh much paines to proove it also by foure or fiue arguments: therefore that place of saint Iames prooueth not their sacrament of annoyling. And then is it destitute of all proofe by Gods worde, and so must bee accounted but a foolish toy (as nowe it is vsed) of mans braine. Neither are they agreed vpon that other high poynt, what parts must be annointed of necessitie, whether all those seuen parts before mentioned, or els only those fiue first, which are the instruments of the senses.

De Vnct. cap. 2.

Some thinke that there is not necessitie that anie one part shoulde bee anoynted rather than other: And o-

Bel. de Vnct. Cap 10.

thers

thers thinke, that the anoynting of euerie of these seuen places is so necessarie, that it is not a perfect sacrament if any be omitted. But maister Bellarmine out of Thomas Aquinas telleth vs, that onely the fiue first are of the essence of the sacrament.

Nowe in this diuersitie of opinions, I knowe not whose part Laurence Vaus will take: but he resolueth vs of one great doubt. If a man want eyes, eares, nose, mouth, or handes, what the Priest should then doe. Hee must oynt the part next to the place where these members should bee. So it seemeth hee alloweth of the first opinion. But are these such matters, as should busie mens mindes so as they doe? No, no, it is the subtiltie of Sathan, to occupie mens heades about such trifles, that in the meane time hee may by false teachers, steale from the heartes of the people the truetly of all christian Religion.

They teach also that this their sacrament of annopling or vnction, may be often receyued. And yet how long they haue beene of that minde, I knowe not, nor find mentioned. But if wee will beleeue Platina, Pope Pius the second seemed not to bee resolued of that poynt, nor so perswaded. For hee at the poynt of death disputed with a learned man the Bishop of Ferrara earnestly, whether hee might againe bee annopled, seeing hee had once before beene annopled. By all which diuersities of iudgements in the most materiall pointes of this their Sacrament, they giue vs iust cause to doubt of their Sacrament it selfe, that it is not of God. And by the way, I cannot but wonder with what faces they can obiect to vs our diuersities in opinions, seeing that they in such materiall poynts of Religion, and in their doctrines that concerne the verie substance of their sacraments, are so verie farre from being al one iudgement. In the life of Pius 2.

And thus briefly we see, how the Papists differ from the scriptures, whereupon themselues inuent: (but al in vaine)

to ground the institution of their Sacrament, and also disagree amongest themselues about the same. And yet with great boldnesse they curse all them, that say that this their Sacrament is not truly, and properly a Sacrament instituted by Christ, for so doeth the Councell of Trent. Wherein I knowe not whether they haue somewhat wounded themselues, both because they say themselues but a little before, that it is insinuated by Christ, which is lesse than instituted. And also it is *tanquam vere & proprie Sacramentum*, as it were (which is a doubtfull speach) truely and properly a Sacrament. But let vs see howe maister Bellarmine prooueth this to bee a Sacrament out of that place of saint Iames. Here can finde, as he supposeth, the outwarde signe. True it is there is an outwarde signe, but it is not that which is required in annoyling nowe: for nowe it must needes be consecrated, but then it was not. The Apostles did vse it especially against the diseases of the bodie, but this Oyle is in the Popish church, vsed especially for a remedie against the sicknesses of the soule. Therefore, I graunt it was in those dayes a signe of health of bodie, whilest God left with his church that gift of healing, but it was neuer a signe of spirituall grace, which is it that now they do affirme.

De Sacram. vnct. sess. 14. can. 1.

Cap. 1.

De Sacram. Vnct. cap. 3.

The outward signe

As for the health of the bodie, they so little regarde that it should be vsed to that ende, that they must not in any wise annoyle them, but such as they haue no hope that they may escape. Whereas the Apostle saint Iames would haue it done to that ende, that God forgiuing them their sinnes, which are many times the cause of sickenesse, they might be Healed, as saith saint Bede vpon this place. As for the promise which is a seconde thing that must be in a sacrament, maister Bellarmine maketh no doubt but that he can proue it. because it is said, The Lord shal raise him vp, and if he haue sinned, they shal be forgiuen him. The meaning of the apostle in this place is verie plaine,

The promise of grace.

that

that whereas in the daies of the primitiue church, there were many myracles wrought by the apostles and others, they did not those things, by any power which they had in themselues, but by the prayer of faith the sicke were healed. And if their sinnes were the cause of their sicknesse (as they are many times, although not alwayes, as by saint Iohns gospel it appeareth) hee promiseth that God, to the ende that they may not doubt but that they shall bee healed, will take away their sinnes, and forgiue their offences, which otherwise might bee a let or hinderance. And that this condition is to be vnderstoode in this promise, it is plaine by these wordes, And if you haue committed sinnes: For the apostle nothing doubted but that they had sinnes, For if wee say wee haue no sinne, wee deceiue our selues, and there is no truth in vs: But hee might iustly doubt whether sickenesse was alwayes layd vpon men, for, and in respect of their sinnes. Therefore to doubt whether they might haue sinned or not, belongeth vnto them that knowe not the corruption of mans nature, which wee cannot thinke of the apostle saint Iames. But to knowe that God doeth not alwayes send afflictions in respect of sinne: hee had learned by that which our Sauiour Christ himselfe sayde vnto his Disciples of the blind man, Neither hath this man sinned, neither his parents, but that the workes of God may be manifest. And for this cause saint Iames saith, If hee committed sinnes, they shall be forgiuen him, that is, if his sinnes haue beene the cause of his sickenesse, his sinnes shall be forgiuen him, that his sickenesse may cease. So then the promise of forgiuenesse of sinnes, which should especially serue to make this oyling a sacrament, is but conditionall, whereas in the true sacraments in deede, the promise of forgiuenesse of sinnes is most certaine, otherwise wee should not haue in the vse of them any true comfort.

Iohn. 9.3

1 Iohn. 1.8.

Iohn. 9.3

Thus then, seeing sicknes sometime commeth of sinne, sometime of other causes, the apostle sayeth, if it come of

sinne,

sinne, not onely the man ouer whom the elders make their faithfull prayer, and whom they so oynt with this visible oyle, shal be raised vp, but also his sinnes, the cause of his sicknesse shal be taken away. But that not forgiuenesse of sinnes was especially regarded in this ceremonie, but bodily health, the fathers afore named doe proue, and maister Bellarmine cannot denie, but that sundrie of the Papists do affirme, whilest they teach that the Apostles in the 6. of saint Marke his Gospell, did practise the selfe same thing that saint Iames commaundeth. But for the institution of this sacrament maister Bellarmine can bring no proofe at all, but onely in respect of this promise of saint Iames, which if it be not of spirituall grace. as I trust I haue proued that it is not, then is there no institution of this sacrament to be found. Then wee see that all this whole building, hangeth vpon a weake foundation, to bee grounded vpon one onely authoritie, and that so little to the purpose vnlesse it be racked beside the meaning: and that out of that Epistle, which although it be in our churches receyued and read, yet we know that the authoritie thereof hath bin doubted of: and therefore the lesse force hath it to proue any thing, that is not taught in any other place. And especially for their annoyling that is now vsed in the Popish church, which is farre vnlike that which the apostles vsed, there is in that place no proofe at all. And as maister Bellarmine hath the better lyking to expounde this place of saint Iames. of another oynting than the apostles vsed. marke eth 6. chapter, because, as hee saieth Luther, Caluine, and Kemnitius, doe take both places for one annointing: euen so doe I, and that with much better reason mislike the Popish anoyling, because it commeth so neare vnto that practise of the heretikes of whom Ieremie speaketh, That they redeeme their dead at the ende of their race or trauell, powring oyle and water vpon their heads. And whereas maister Bellarmine would proue out of Epiphanius, that this oyntment was vsed when they were

The institution of this Sacrament.

Cap. 3

l. 1. cap. 18.

were dead. And therefore therein they differ from the Papists, yet saint Augustine in his booke of heresies, saieth, they did it when they were dying. So that master Bellarmine must not thinke so to face out the matter, as if those heretikes were nothing like them. And whereas they vsed water also with their Oyle, although they differ therein from the church of Rome, yet the difference is nothing so great by many degrees, betweene the Papists and those heretikes, as is betweene the apostles and the papists for this poynt, as maie appeare by that which before hath beene saide. But after this great scarcitie of proofe out of the scriptures, hee commeth at length to the authoritie of man. And hee will proone what men will say in his behalfe, where God keepeth silence. And the first that he bringeth in is Innocentius that lived at the least foure hundred yeares after Christ. What, was it no Sacrament for foure hundred yeares, and nowe vpon a sudden is it become a sacrament? howe doeth hee proue it to bee a sacrament? He bringeth no reason, hee hath no proofe, no, neither yet doeth hee so much as say it is a sacrament properly so called, but that it is *Genus Sacramenti*, A kinde of Sacrament. What then, if we graunt to master Bellarmine that which Pope Innocentius saieth? If it bee a kinde of Sacrament, as hee saieth, is it, therefore a sacrament truely and properly as maister Bellarmine saieth? I denie that argument, and maister Bellarmine will not proue it. And yet to helpe his bad cause, hee lowdly and lewdly belyeth Innocentius his woordes, in that hee affirmeth that Innocentius saieth expresselie and plainlie, that this oynting is that sacrament explaned by saint Iames. But Innocentius hath no such woordes, no neither yet any thing like. But M. Bellarmine, to deceiue them that can not looke into the fathers, doth many times falsifie them to make his cause to seeme better.

Cap. 16.

De sacra. vnct. li. 3. cap. 4.

And nowe what cause hath this seconde Achylles of the Catholikes (for Eckius did bestow that name first vpon

himselfe,

himselfe, as you may see in his Enchiridion in the title of the church in the margent) what cause I saie, hath this challenging champion thus to brag against Kemnitius, that hee durst not so much as name this Innocentius. When his testimonie is examined, the tracke is great, but he doth not hit the marke that maister Bellarmine would haue him to leauell at. As for Kemnitius if he haue but his due praise, we must needes confesse, that by his learning and trauell, he hath more beaten downe the walles of that popish Babilon, than that all the papists if they ioine together hand in hand, shall be able with all their skill and cunning to raise it vp againe. Of Innocentius the third, because he came so late he is not worth the answering: for he liued about 1200. yeares after Christ in time of ignorance and much superstition. As for the Councels which he alleageth, the first is the Nicene councell translated into latine out of the Arabic tongue. But since that canon is not amongst those canons, which wee haue in the tomes of the councels, and in those coppies that hitherto haue beene counted the true councels, we neede not much regarde those farre fetched authorities. His second authoritie is out of the councell of Cabilon, and some other particular councels, and although he commend their antiquitie, yet the first of them was almost 800. yeares after Christ. And those which I haue examined, make not for his purpose. For they proue not, that this annointing is a sacrament properly so called. Now for the fathers, master Bellarmine needeth no aduersary, he confesseth his want of proofe out of them: For he deuideth the fathers into two sortes. The one he confesseth doe not plainly saie that it is a sacrament. Why then doth he produce them? he hath taken in hand to proue that anoyling, as it is vsed in the popish church, is a true and proper sacrament. If they will not proue this, they maie holde their tongues. For to this end only are they to be alleaged. An other sort there are, who speake it plainely, as he telleth vs. But they are of no credit, neither

are

are once named among the ancient fathers. The eldest of them is about 800. yeares after Christ. And for his examples of some few men what they haue done, it is no proofe to vs, that we ought so to doe. They might haue their reasons that might well induce them to it. They might also doe therein, as in many things many haue done of a blinde zeale, and foolish deuotion. How or in what sort they haue done that which they did, I wil not take vpon me to iudge: as for their doings they ought not to be an example to any man, so that we should be bound to follow them. But hee wil proue by reason, that it must needs be a sacrament: For since God hath by a sacrament holpen vs, at the entraunce into the church, and also in our continuance in the same, we maie not imagine that his prouidence shall faile vs at our going out of the church: these are maister Bellarmine his wordes. It might briefly answere, that we are not to teach God what we thinke conuenient that he should doe, but to see what he hath done, and to content our selues therewith, and to frame our selues to perfourme the same. But if God faile in his prouidence, if their anoyling be not a sacrament, then must we imagine that God had no due regarde of the fathers of the old world, or of the patriarkes, or of the godly vnder the law. For vntill Christs time, maister Bellarmine will confesse they had not this Sacrament. Yea the Apostles and all other the Godly and constant Martirs in Christs church, had not that sacrament. Neither yet did they make complaint for want of the same, but comfortably and patiently endured all torments with great ioy, although they had not this anoyling, nay amie hope to haue it, no neither once thought of it. Lastly, our Sauiour Christ to prepare vs against death teacheth vs, that whosoeuer beleeueth in him shall not perish, but haue euerlasting life: and to cause vs not to feare it, he saith, that he is the resurrection and the life. Many notable lessons did our Sauiour Christ giue to his disciples, before he left the world to goe to his father, which are recorded by Saint Iohn

Bellarm. de sac. vnct. li. 1. cap. 5.

from

from the twelfth to the seuenteenth chapters. And although he vse all arguments to comfort them, yet he neuer once thought of this anoyling, which yet then if he had purposed to leaue vnto his church anie such Sacrament, it had beene good time to haue deliuered them for their comforte. To be short, whatsoeuer he commaunded vs to vse for the strengthning of our faith, with boldnesse we may, and with comfort and readinesse we ought to doe: But it is farre from either true or sound comfort, in the agony of death, or a sufficient weapon, to withstand the assaults of Sathan, and conflicts of conscience, to haue standing by thee some Idol pastor, whose greatest good, that he either can or will doe vnto thee, is to grease some parts of thy body. Let the world esteeme of these things as they will. But this is certaine that it is only true obedience that hath the promise of blessing. And without the commandement there can be no obedience, either in our duties towardes God, or our conuersation amongst men. For obedience is nothing els, but an earnest applying of our selues to doe that which is pleasing vnto God, and which he hath commanded. It is also far from the maiestie of Gods spirit, to deliuer to vs such trifling toyes, thereby to comfort the afflicted conscience. And thus I trust it appeareth, that this their sacrament of anoyling, is but a deuise of their owne braine, hauing neither institution from Christ, neither any commaundement from his apostles, or example in the scriptures, especiallie as it is now vsed in the church of Rome, either for the matter whereof it must consist, or the manner how it must bee done, or the end vnto which they especially haue regard in that ceremony.

I had thought here to haue ended both this treatise of the sacraments and this chapter, but before I go anie farther, I would haue the christian reader to marke the euill dealing of the popish church, who with their tongues and pennes proclaime as lowd as they can, that our doctrine is not catholicke, it is new, is lately deuised. And yet we ap-

appeale to the scriptures, & haue testimony for vs also, the
consent of the fathers of the purer times. And on the ordinary
the church of Rome crieth still they are the catholick church,
they haue the catholicke religion, yea all that is with them
is catholicke. But if by the rules of catholicke which Vin-
centius Lyrinense giueth (with whose authority they seek
often to stoppe our mouthes) we examine their doctrines:
we shall finde them as farre from the catholicke religion,
as the priests and rulers amongst the Iews were from the
truth. For whereas he accounteth no doctrine catholicke,
but that which hath beene taught at all times, in all places,
and by all men, or at the least by the most, and the best lear-
ned, and godliest men, wee might by this rule reiect
manie of their doctrines, which they deliuer to vs as ca-
tholicke and necessarie, so that without beleeuing them
there is no saluation. For shortnesse sake, let vs looke
into this that last I handled. They will haue it a catho-
licke doctrine to teach that anoyling is a true and proper
Sacrament, yea, and the councell of Trent curseth them
that saie the contrarie. And yet maister Bellarmine, who
saith as much in effect as they all can saie in this point,
how catholickely doth hee proue it? He with much adoe
wresteth for it one place out of Saint Iames, and hath not
one mo in all the Scripture for him. Then leapeth hee
more then foure hundreth yeares after Christ, and pick-
eth out one pope Innocent, who saith it is a kinde of Sa-
crament. If he had proued it to be a Sacrament properly
so called, yet had he beene but one witnesse in foure hun-
dred yeares. Then about 1200. years after Christ, he hath
gotten another witnes, and he is a pope also, Innocent the
third. Then he telleth vs of the 69. canon of the councell of
Nice, which had in al but twenty canons. Al aboue twenty
were fetched out of Arabia, but are neither mẽtioned in the
Nicene councel set forth by thẽselues, neither yet of Ruffi-
nus in his ecclesiastical history, where he setteth downe the
canõs of that councel, who although he make 22. in nũber,

Commendatio adversus haereses.

Li. 1. cap. 8.

yet

from the twelfth to the seuenteenth chapters. And although he vse all arguments to comfort them, yet he neuer once thought of this anoyling, which yet then if he had purposed to leaue vnto his church anie such Sacrament, it had beene good time to haue deliuered them for their comforte. To be short, whatsoeuer he commaunded vs to vse for the strengthning of our faith, with boldnesse we may, and with comfort and readinesse we ought to doe: But it is farre from either true or sound comfort, in the agony of death, or a sufficient weapon, to withstand the assaults of Sathan, and conflicts of conscience, to haue standing by thee some Idol pastor, whose greatest good, that he either can or will doe vnto thee, is to grease some parts of thy body. Let the world esteeme of these things as they will. But this is certaine that it is only true obedience that hath the promise of blessing. And without the commandement there can be no obedience, either in our duties towardes God, or our conuersation amongst men. For obedience is nothing els, but an earnest applying of our selues to doe that which is pleasing vnto God, and which he hath commanded. It is also far from the maiestie of Gods spirit, to deliuer to vs such trifling toyes, thereby to comfort the afflicted conscience. And thus I trust it appeareth, that this their sacrament of anoyling, is but a deuise of their owne braine, hauing neither institution from Christ, neither any commaundement from his apostles, or example in the scriptures, especiallie as it is now vsed in the church of Rome, either for the matter whereof it must consist, nor the manner how it must bee done, or the end vnto which they especially haue regard in that ceremony.

I had thought here to haue ended both this treatise of the sacraments and this chapter, but before I go anie farther, I would bade the christian reader to marke the euill dealing of the popish church, who with their tongues and pennes proclaime as lowd as they can, that our doctrine is not catholicke, it is new, is lately deuised. And yet we ap-

appeale to the scriptures, & haue testimony for vs also, the cõsent of the fathers of the purer times. And on the cõtrary the church of Rome crieth still, they are the catholick church, they haue the catholicke religion, yea all that is with them is catholicke. But if by the rules of catholicke which Vincentius Lyrinensis giueth (with whose authority they seek often to stoppe our mouthes) we examine their doctrines; we shall finde them as farre from the catholicke religion, as the priests and rulers amongst the Iews were from the truth. For whereas he accounteth no doctrine catholicke, but that which hath beene taught at all times, in all places, and by all men, or at the least by the most, and the best learned, and godliest men, wee might by this rule reiect manie of their doctrines, which they deliuer to vs as catholicke and necessarie, so that without beleeuing them there is no saluation. For shortnesse sake, let vs looke into this that last I handled. They will haue it a catholicke doctrine to teach that anoyling is a true and proper Sacrament, yea, and the councell of Trent curseth them that saie the contrarie. And yet maister Bellarmine, who saith as much in effect as they all can saie in this point, how catholickely doth hee proue it? He with much adoe wresteth for it one place out of Saint Iames, and hath not one mo in all the Scripture for him. Then leapeth hee more then foure hundreth yeares after Christ, and picketh out one pope Innocent, who saith it is a kinde of Sacrament. If he had proued it to be a Sacrament properly so called, yet had he beene but one witnesse in foure hundred yeares. Then about 1200. years after Christ, he hath gotten another witnes, and he is a pope also, Innocent the third. Then he telleth vs of the 69. canon of the councell of Nice, which had in al but twenty canons. Al aboue twenty were fetched out of Arabia, but are neither mẽtioned in the Nicene councel set forth by thẽselues, neither yet of Ruffinus in his ecclesiastical history, where he setteth downe the canõs of that councel, who although he make 22. in nũber, yet

Commonitorio aduersus hæreses.

Li. 1. cap. 6.

Yet is the matter no other than is set downe in the 1. booke of the councels in those 20. chapters. Besides there are many other strong reasons, & pregnant presumptions to proue those 50. canons (for they haue 70.) to be falsly added to ỹ councel, & therfore they deserue no credit. He also alledgeth some particular councels, which he commendeth for their antiquitie, and yet the ancientest of them, is about 800. yeares after Christ. And about that time also are the most ancient fathers, that seeme to say any thing for him. Then if thou knowest the sunne to shine at noone day, thou maist also know that this is not a catholicke doctrine, neither can be so accompted. It hath not beene taught at all times, not in al places, not by al or the most of the learned. No, it hath had scarce one sufficient witnes in 1200. yeares. But for the substance of religion which we teach. if we haue not a vniuersal consent of the scriptures, and also the testimony of the fathers of the church, in her most pure times, we craue no credit, we aske no hearing. Therefore that which wee teach is the only catholicke faith, because it hath the vniuersall consent of the purer times: that which for the most part they teach, is but new, not warranted by the word, not known or not taught amongst the godly fathers, at the least for 400. or 500. yeares. Which I thought good vpon this occasion thus offered, to note vnto the christian reader, that I might pull away from the faces of those counterfeites, the visard of catholicke, vniuersality, antiquity, and consent, that their religion may appeare indeede as it is, new, not old, particular not catholicke, false not true: because it is the deuise of man, whose wisedom is folly, whose words are lies: and not the wil of God, which is the infallible rule, and of whose word not one title shall perish. And thus I trust it appeareth, that they who brag most, of the name of catholicke church, are the greatest enemies to true catholicke religion, teaching that which is nothing lesse then catholicke.

Of

Of originall sinne, what it is: And whether Concupiscence be sinne, or not.

Chap. 21

The Protestants

THat all mankind which is conceiued of vnclean seede, is also infected with original sinne, no man denieth: but the question is, what this original sinne is, which we confes to bee in vs. We therefore say, It is a generall corruption of our whole nature, which corruption as an inheritance we receiue from *Adam*. In our minde is ignorance, where was light & knowledge. In our heart is vnaptnesse, and vnreadinesse to any thing that is good, in steade of an earnest forwardnes, to serue God sincerely: whereby it commeth to passe, that by concupiscence and lust wee are inticed to sinne. Which concupiscence, because the Apostle to the Romanes doeth often call sin, we also say it is sinne, not only because it proceedeth from sin, and also proceedeth from it: but also because it is a thing in it selfe contrary to Gods Lawe.

Originall sinne.

The Papists

BVT the Papistes, although they can not deny, but that wee all haue originall sinne: yet woulde they haue the force therof as litle knowen as may bee. And therefore some of them haue taught, that it is nothing else but the imputation of Adams sinne vnto vs, and not any corruption in our selues, as Ambrose Catharinus, & Pighius, *two notable papists. And others find fault, that we do so amplify the corruption of the nature of man by originall sin, as though nothing that is good could come from it. As for cõcupiscence, they wil not grant that it is sin in the regenerat. And yet the Apostle S. Paul being a man regenerate, confesseth it to be sin in himselfe very often, as may appeare.* Rom. 7.

Andrad. Orthod. expli. lib. 3. de axiom. 3. Cens. Colon. dialog. 1.

The reaſons which moue vs, thus to laie open and amplifie our owne corrupt nature, and to confeſſe the power and force of originall ſinne in vs are theſe. Partly our owne woful experience, whereby if we haue any true feeling of our fraile eſtate, or knowe any thing of our vnwillingnes to that which is good, and our ready inclination to that which is euil: we muſt needes confeſſe that the lawe of our flesh, is alwaies rebellious to the law of the ſpirit which is in vs: And that the wiſedome of the flesh is ſuch a froward enemy to God, as is not ſubiect to the law of God neither indeede can bee. Partlie alſo the manifold and manifeſt teſtimonies out of Gods word, which doe plainlie proue, that this originall ſinne hath ſo corrupted our whole nature, that it can bring forth nothing that is good or godly. Such is that All the imaginations of the thoughts of mans heart, are only euill alwaies. And that alſo. The imagination of mans heart is euill from his youth. Whereby we muſt needes confeſſe and acknowledge it to be true, that we are not ſufficient of our ſelues, to thinke any thing as of our ſelues, in thoſe thinges that belong vnto true godlines. And why? Becauſe that by one man ſinne entred into the world, and by the offence of one, the fault came on all men to condemnation. In this reſpect the Apoſtle calleth ſuch as are not regenerate, Enemies to God, the children of wrath by nature, veſſels of diſhonour, and by ſuch like names whereby hee ſheweth plainely, what we ſhould iudge, or how we ſhould eſteeme of the ſtrength and force of originall ſinne, in them that are not regenerate. Namely, that no good at all can come from them in thought, word or deed. Which doctrine the Church of Rome will in no wiſe heare of. But of that I muſt ſpeake in another place. But euen we that haue receiued the firſt fruites of the ſpirite, and whom God hath deliuered from the condemnation of that common corruption: we, I ſaie, do finde, that if ſinne raigne not ouer vs, yet it dwelleth in vs. Whereby wee are

Rom. 7. 23.

Rom. 8. 7.

Gen. 6. 5.

Gen. 8. 21.

2. Cor. 3. 5.

Rom. 5. 12. 18.

manie

many times forced, To doe that euill thing that wee woulde not, and to leaue vndoone, That good that wee woulde doe. Wee feele that there is, A lawe in our members, rebelling against the Lawe of our minde, and leading vs captiue to the Lawe of sinne, which is in our members. Insomuch as wee are forced, not onely to crie out with the Prophet Dauid, Who can vnderstand his faultes? Cleanse mee from secret faultes: but also continually to pray as Christ willeth vs, Forgiue vs our trespasses. For sinne hangeth so fast on vs, that euen When wee woulde doe good, then euil is present with vs. And therefore well may our spirite striue, that the flesh preuaile not, and the new man waxe euery day stronger against the olde man: yet, so long as wee carry about with vs, this body subiect to corruption, Sathan will not leaue buffeting vs, sinne will not cease to assault vs. But, as a froward and cruell enemy, euen then when it is almost quite subdued, and at the last cast, yet will it stirre, euen then, I say, will it striue to hurt vs. And this our deadly enemy was bred and borne with vs, wee carry him alwayes about vs. So long as wee liue wee cannot shake him off. Which made the Apostle saint Paul so wearie of this wicked world, that hee desired to bee dissolued, and to bee with Christ. And no marueil. For, what can a spirituall minded man see heere, that may make him desire to liue in this flesh? In his minde there is such ignorance of heauenly things, as that although he be continually taught, yet hee needeth continually to pray, O teach mee thy Statutes, and to aske that the eyes of his vnderstanding may be lightened, by the spirit of wisedome and reuelation, by the knowledge of Christ, more and more in all wisedome and spirituall vnderstanding. For, the perfection of knowledge that heere wee can attaine vnto, is euery day to learne, and when wee know most concerning heauenly things, yet our knowledge is vnperfect. Yea, that

Rom.7.19

31

Psal.19.12

Heb.12.1.

Rom.7.21.

Philip.1.23.

Psal.119.12

Ep.1.17,18. Philip.1.9

Coloss.1.9.

which wee knowe not, is much more than that wee doe knowe.

Then if hee conſider of his owne heart, he ſhall finde the affections thereof ſo rebellious againſt the ſpirite, ſo running headlong vnto worldly and wicked luſtes, that
Pſal.86.11 it will force him for to pray, Knit my heart vnto thee,
Pſal.5.8. that I may feare thy Name. Leade mee in the waie of thy righteouſneſſe, make thy way plaine before my face. Yea, hee will bee driuen to confeſſe, that no
Ioh.6.44. man can come vnto Chriſt to ſerue him, Vnleſſe the Father drawe him. So that euen in reſpect of thoſe excellent thinges that man doeth ſeeme to haue, he may truRom.7.18. ly ſay, I knowe that in mee, that is, in my fleſh, there dwelleth no good thing. For his minde is darkned that it can not knowe, his heart is clogged that it will not obey ſincerely, and readily as it ought Gods holie will.

Thus then it appeareth, not onely, that all that are borne of vncleane ſeede, are conceiued and borne in originRom.7.24. Rom.8.23 all ſinne, but alſo, that the ſame doth make great trouble euen to the godly, yea, it maketh them to ſigh for their deliuerance from this their body, which by reaſon of ſinne, is ſo ſubiect to death.

Concupiſcence is ſin

And now, for this concupiſcence, by meanes whereof wee are thus inticed vnto ſinne, and alſo hindered from ſincere obedience, the church of Rome will in no wiſe yeelde that it ſhall bee ſinne in the regenerate, vnleſſe it alſo drawe conſent of reaſon to yeelde vnto it: for this they all teach. And yet ſaint Paul in the Epiſtle to the Romanes often calleth it ſin, as M. Bellarmine himſelfe confeſſeth, yea, and that in the regenerate. But it is ſo called
De amiſſ. gratiæ lib. 5. cap. 10. (ſaith he) vnproperly, not becauſe it is ſinne, but becauſe it is the cauſe of ſinne, and commeth alſo of ſinne. But how doeth hee proone that out of any thing that ſaint Paul hath ſaid in thoſe places? Firſt, becauſe ſaint Paul ſaith,
Rom.6.12. Let not ſinne raigne in this your mortall bodie. Due

of

of which words Master Bellarmine reasoneth thus: The Apostle saieth, that this sinne is in the body, not in the minde, but sinne properly so called can not bee in the body: therefore the Apostle calleth not concupiscence sinne, because it is so properly. I may aunswere with Saint Augustine, that the flesh neuer lusteth without the soule: and also out of Saint Ambrose vpon this place, that the bodie is here taken for the whole man, bodie and soule: Neither is there any that doeth restraine this word Bodie vnto that part of man that is a distinct part from the soule, amongst all the auncient Writers that I haue seene. And then Maister Bellarmines argument hath no force, because Saint Paules wordes may haue this sence, Let not sinne raigne either in your body or soule: and that sinne may be in the soule, sinne (I say) properly so called, I trust Master Bellarmine will not deny. But the words themselues do most plainely shew, that he speaketh in this place of that part of man, wherein sinne properly so called may be: for he speaketh of that part of man, wherin raigning sinne may be, otherwise his exhortation were needlesse: but raigning sinne, is sinne properly so called, as all doe confesse, therefore sinne properly so called, may be in this mortall body, whereof heere the Apostle saint Paul speaketh. And therefore Master Bellarmine triumpheth too hastily, when as he concludeth, that Saint Paul plainely signifieth hee calleth concupiscence sinne, but not properly, but vnproperly. But I may more iustly conclude against Master Bellarmine. The Apostle speaketh there of sinne properly so called. And he speaketh of concupiscence: therefore concupiscence is sin properly so called. The *minor* is confessed here by master Bellarmine, in that he doth alleage it to proue his purpose of concupiscence. The *maior* also is proued out of master Bellarmine. For, the principall thing that he doth alleadge to teach vs, that Concupiscence is no sinne: that it is not in that same part wherein sinne can bee, but in the flesh onely, where

De perfect. iustitiæ.

can be no sinne. But if it bee founde once to bee in that part of man wherein sinne may bee, hee will not then denie, but is also sinne. Therfore thus I reason, the apostle speaketh there of that sinne that is in that part of the body, wherein sinne is, that is properly so called, as before I haue proued: therfore he speaketh of sinne properly so called. The other place alledged by master Bellarmine to proue that saint Paule calleth not concupiscence sinne in the proper signification, is this, There dwelleth not in me, that is, in my flesh, anie good. Therefore concupiscence is in the flesh. How vnnecessarie a consequence this argument hath, the verie children may perceiue. And also this word flesh, euerie one that is acquainted but with the principles of diuinitie knoweth to be spoken of whatsoeuer is not regenerate in man, euen the verie mind of man. But of this I haue spoken sufficiently in the answer to the former place. Master Bellarmine also vseth some other reasons to proue that the apostles calleth concupiscence sinne vnproperly but they are not worth speaking of. As this is one. Sinne is manie times called vnproperly, therefore here it is not called sinne properly. A kinde of reasoning which maister Bellarmine immediately afterwardes reproueth in Luther, and yet himselfe vseth it. Another reason whereby I proue concupiscence to be sinne in the proper signification, is because It rebelleth against the lawe of the minde. For master Bellarmine himselfe confesseth that to be vnderstoode of concupiscence. As also by The law of the minde, he vnderstandeth The rule of a good action, which must needes be the law of God. Thus therefore I reason, whatsoeuer affection or lust rebelleth against the law of the minde, is in truth sinne: but concupiscence is lust that rebelleth against the law of the minde, therefore concupiscence is in truth sinne. The *maior* may be proued out of saint Iohn, who defineth sin to be a Breach of law, or lawlesnesse. But yet master Bellarmine wil not confesse that whatsoeuer rebelleth against the law is sinne properly,

De amiss. grat. l. 5. c. 13

Rom. 7. 18.

Rom. 7. 23. De Amiss. gratiæ li. 5. cap. 6.

Ibid. cap. 10

1. Iohn. 3. 4.

properly, and namely concupiſcence, becauſe it rebelleth onely as a thing ſtirring vp, and cauſing to tranſgreſſe, as I ſaid of the diuell (ſaith he.) I am glad that concupiſcence which the papiſts will in no wiſe to be ſinne of it ſelfe, hath deſerued no better of her owne friends and patrons, then to be matched in the ſame yoke with the diuell, who is a lyar and the father thereof. But maiſter Bellarmine cannot ſhift off this argument vnder this coulour. Wee inquire what concupiſcence is, he telleth vs what it worketh, wee would knowe the nature of it, he telleth vs, the effect of it. There are therefore in concupiſcence two things to be conſidered: the one is, what it bringeth foorth in vs, of the which we ſay with ſaint Iames, When luſt hath conceyued, it bringeth forth ſin. The other, what it is in it ſelfe, or in it owne nature. To that we anſwere out of the apoſtle in many places, that it is ſin, as before it hath bin ſhewed: yea and in this very reſpect, that it hath in it a repugnancy againſt the law of the minde, and followeth not the direction of the law of God. For euen as it is crooked, that is, not euen to the ſtraite rule: ſo is it ſinne, that is, not agreeable to the moſt infallible rule of Gods law, which I take to be maiſter Bellarmines meaning, expounding the nature of the worde ἀνομία which ſaint Iohn vſeth, he ſaith It is a departing from the law. If then concupiſcence be examined, euen before it bee conſented vnto, by Gods Lawe doe wee not finde that it is a motion diſagreeing from Gods Lawe? No man can denie it. For looke vpon the luſt that mooueth to vncleanneſſe, to ſtealth, to crueltie, although the heart conſent not, yet in that verie luſt, is that, that diſagreeth from Gods Lawe. So that this is not true that maiſter Bellarmine ſaith, that concupiſcence rebelleth againſt the lawe onelie, as it ſtirreth vp or cauſeth to ſinne: ſeeing in it ſelfe it hath that nature that ſwarueth from the law.

De Amiſſ. grat. li. 5. cap. 14.

Iohn. 8. 44.

Iam. 1. 15.

De Amiſſ. grat. li. 5. cap. 141.

1. Iohn. 3. 4

S. Auguſt. alſo proueth my *maior* in that definition that

Cont. Fauſt. li. 22. cap. 27. he giueth of ſinne, ſaying, that Sinne is that which is ſaid, done, or luſted againſt the eternall law. And that that is a definition of ſinne, properly ſo called, maiſter Bellarmine cannot denie. Nowe for my *minor* propoſition, which is this, That concupiſcence rebelleth againſt the lawe of the minde, maiſter Bellarmine himſelfe confeſſeth it in plaine wordes, but yet ſo, as that he ſeemeth to mee to counterfeit Juglers, when they would play a tricke of leger-demaine. For their greateſt ſkill is *Deceptio viſus*, the deceiuing of our ſight, whereby they ſeeme to do that they doe not, or with a little cleanly conueyance, to beguile the ſimple. For although he confeſſe, that theſe luſts rebell againſt the lawe, yet ſaith he, they rebell againſt the law as it ſheweth the ende, not as it commaundeth the meanes. But who can imagine that euer ſaint Paule ſpeaking of this point of Diuinitie, which is moſt neceſſarie to bee vnderſtoode of euerie one, euen from the higheſt, to the loweſt, would ſpeake or write ſo ſubtilly or obſcurely? And who tolde him theſe luſts ſtriue not againſt the lawe, as it commaundeth the meanes, that is to ſay, as it commaundeth to reſiſt, and not to yeeld to them? Doubtleſſe that luſt, which rebelleth againſt this commaundement, Thou ſhalt not luſt, will neuer yeeld when it is reſiſted: for euerie thing naturally ſeeketh the preſeruation of it ſelfe. But the reſiſting of luſt is the deſtruction of it, therefore it will not yeeld to it. And as reaſon teacheth this, ſo ſaint Paule by experience found it to be true, when hee ſaide, Sinne tooke occaſion by the commaundement, and wrought in mee all maner of concupiſcence. So that this concupiſcence, is by reſiſting, made more ſtubburne, and is ſo farre from yeelding, that it fighteth more fiercely againſt the lawe. And hereof is that combat and battell, which the godly haue betweene the fleſh and the ſpirite. The wicked are not acquainted with it, becauſe they willingly yeelde to their luſts. But the godly, becauſe they reſiſt the ſame, Doe ſee another lawe in their members,

De Amiſſ. gratiæ, lib. 5 cap. 10. & 14

De Amiſſ. gratiæ. li. 5. cap. 10.

Rom. 7. 23.

rebel-

rebelling against the lawe of their minde. Rom.7.23.

Thus we see that this distinction whereby master Bellarmine striueth against trueth, is neither according to the meaning of the Apostle, nor hath any colour of trueth. But here by the way I must note, how grossely, and how absurdly maister Bellarmine in the place next before alledged affirmeth, that he is not a sinner, that attaineth not to the ende of the commaundement. His reason is, because it lieth not in his power: nó more thã he is too blame, that being commaunded to subdue the enemies, can not do it. But maister Bellarmine should consider where is the cause of this want in vs, and through whose fault it is that wee can not obey this commaundement, thou shalt not lust. If it bee in man, as in trueth it is, because hee fell from that estate of innocencie wherein hee was created, then is there no reason, but that sinne should bee imputed vnto vs, for not performing that commaundement, thou shalt not lust. And by this also it appeareth, that maister Bellarmine his similitude is nothing like, because that the subduing of the enemie was not in their power. But not to lust wickedly was in mans power once, which because through his owne fault hee lost, the not fulfilling of that commaundement, may iustly bee layde to his charge for sinne. Thirdly, I thus proue concupiscence to be sinne: Not to loue the Lorde our God, with all our heart, with all our soule, with all our strength, and with all our thought, is sinne. But to lust, is to faile in this loue. For if the heart consent not, yet at the least the thought by this concupiscence is hindered from this perfection of loue, therefore concupiscence is sinne. Againe, Originall sinne, is sinne properly so called, as maister Bellarmine confesseth: But Concupiscence is originall sinne, as the maister of Sentences affirmeth, therefore concupiscence is sinne, properly so called. Againe, whatsoeuer maketh vs hated of God is sinne. Andrad. Orthod. Explic. lib. 3. But concupiscence maketh vs hated of God, Bellar. de Amiss.

Luke.10.27

Augustde perfect. iustitiæ. cont. celest.

De August. gratiæ li.4. Cap. 2. Li.2. Dist.30.

Amiss. gratiæ, lib 5. cap. 13: therefore concupiscence is sinne. And thus much briefly, to proue concupiscence not onely to be called, but indeed to be sinne. But what need I stand so much hereupon? If the church of Rome ment that the light of the truth should shine vnto men, she would neuer cast these mists before their eyes, thus to contend about tearmes and wordes. For themselues doe ascribe vnto concupiscence, both the nature, and the effects of sinne, when they say it *a* is vice, it is truly euill, *b* it is vnlawful, condemned, and hated of God, *c* that Andrad. saith, sin only can worke. For all this M. Bellarmine affirmeth of concupiscence, and many such like things, which whether they may be affirmed of any thing but sinne, let maister Bellarmine and his fauourites well consider. But I for my part doe thinke, I may truely conclude, and boldly affirme, seeing the Apostle so often calleth it sinne, without any expounding of himselfe to speake vnproperly, seeing it rebelleth against the lawe of the minde, and maketh such a want in the loue of God, that in this and such like respects, concupiscence is sinne properly so called, whatsoeuer the Councell of Trent decree to the contrarie.

De Amiss. gratia. li. 5. cap. 13 a. b Can 24. c Cap. 13. Orthod. explic. li. 3.

Sess. 5. can. 5

Of the works of Infidels, or such as are not regenerate.

Chap. 22.

THE PROTESTANTS

WE then being thus infected with the filth of *originall sin*, and by our concupiscence, which can not whilest here we liue be rooted out of vs, being inthised to sin, and hindred in

THE PAPISTS

But the papists, as they will in no wise that concupiscence is of it selfe sinne, no nor in the vnregenerate, but only in respect that it is destitute of originall righteousnesse: so doe they seeke by

Andrad. orthod. explic. li. 3.

THE PROTESTANTE.

in al good: what can come from them, that *haue their cogitations darkned, through the ignorance that is in the, but that they walke after the lusts of the flesh, in fulfilling the will of the flesh.* And so are in deed no better than dead in sinnes and trespasses, by their owne nature *the children of wrath.* So that from such no good can proceede, in thought, word, or deed, and in such no good can be, vntil God of his abundant mercie, haue begotten them again vnto a liuelie hope *of immortall seede, by the worde of God,* hauing by his holy spirite renued the light of their mind, and reformed the frowardnesse of their heart. Vntill then (I say) what excellent vertues so euer they seeme to haue, yet is there nothing in the acceptable to God, bicause they haue not that fountaine of regeneration, frō whence onely can spring that which god accepteth for good. Neither haue they faith, without which nothing can please God.

Ephe. 4. 18

Ephe. 2. 1. 3

5

4

1. Pet. 1. 3

23

Heb. 11. 6.

THE PAPISTE.

by all meanes, to cloake and couer the corruption and sinfulnesse, of our wretched nature. Hereof commeth it that they shame not to teach, that the workes of infidels and godlesse persons; such as wee account Turkes, or Iewes, maie bee without spot of sinne, and woorthie of notable prayse. As though a filthie spring coulde sende foorth pleasant waters, or an euill tree could beare good fruit, or a branch that is not of the vine tree, coulde haue a kindlie grape. All which the scriptures denie. Doe men gather grapes of thornes, or figs of thistles? *No doubtlesse. For,* An euill man out of the treasure of his heart, bringeth forth euill. *It is then most certaine, that where the spirite of regeneration is not to sanctifie the heart, (as in the infidels it is not) wee can looke for no workes, but such as proceede from that bitter roote of sinne, which must needes bee euill and vnsauourie before God.*

Andrad. ibidem.

Iam. 3. 11

Math. 7. 18

Iohn. 15. 4.

Mat. 7. 18

Luke. 6. 45.

It may iustly be wondered at, why they, who take vpon them the name of holy catholicke church, & such as account themselues the members thereof, doe so stifly and stubbornely, maintaine so bad a cause, and defend, yea commend the actions of such godlesse men. For not only the particular writers among them, excuse from sinne the actions of Infidels, but also the councell of Trent doth hold them all accursed that dare say they are truly sinne. But their feare is, least if the nature of man be set forth in her owne colours, and duely considered of, the doctrine of merite by workes will seeme more absurd. But if the workes of graceless and godlesse men, may be thought to be voide of sinne: how much the rather may we thinke, that the works of the faithfull may be so perfect, that they may merite at Gods handes? And in truth no man can denie, but that there is no comparison, betweene the workes of the godlie and the vngodly. Therefore that they may prepare a way for their doctrine of merites, they would first make vs beleeue, that euen in the wicked there may be good workes. And least men should condemne the corruption of this our nature, being not renued by the spirit of God, as it iustlie deserueth, and so sincerely confesse, that we haue in vs no good, but that it commeth wholy from God: the councell of Trent doth not any thing mislike those opinions, that commend the works euen of infidels, yea attributing some merit vnto them, as doe some of the scholemen, but onlie accurseth them that accompt them to be sinne. And a Franciscan frier, reading vpon the second chapter of the epistle to the Romanes, did most blasphemouslie teach, in the hearing of manie of them that were at the councel, and in the time of the councell, that They who had no knowledge of Christ, and yet lived honestly were saued. Which his vnchristian doctrine, was so farre from being condemned by that Antichristian councell, that the diuines that were sent from the protestantes to that councel, made their complaint to the emperours Ambassadours that he was heard with

Sess. 6. can. 57.

Sleiden. comment. li. 23. An. 1552.

with great liking. And indeed the councel did not accurse that doctrine, or him that taught it. No, the councel did not determine, but as Andradius telleth vs, hath left it free for euery man to thinke as they wil of the workes of them that are not regenerate: this only that councel will not permit vs to thinke, that they are sinne, because they are not of faith. That therefore that the scripture teacheth vs, wee maie not once thinke of, but all other absurd opinions of men are very tollerable. Is not this strange dealing, that the spirit of truth only must not speake, and the lying spirits of foolish men, may saie what they will? But let vs see what reasons they alleadge to induce them to this persuasion. I wil saie nothing of that which maister Bellarmine, (nothing like a graue deuine, which should with all diligence and praier search out, and with all humility submit himselfe to the trueth, but rather like a foolish & wrangling sophister, whose care were onely to contend, to make good that which he saith) most impudently affirmeth, enquiring, what knowlege of moral vertues men may haue by the powers of nature, & Gods general help. Of two opinions he preferreth one, and why? So much the more gladly (saith he) we doe embrace and defend it, howe much the more our aduersaries mislike it. I see now it is no great marvel, though these pretended catholickes, doe manifestly and wilfully gainsaie and withstand manie thinges, most consonant to the infallible word of God. For I perceiue, that if we like of it, it is cause good inough for them to mislike of it. Only this will I saie, that because this persuasion is foolish, and dangerous: Saint Iames giueth a good caueat to all that are of such an humour, My brethren haue not the faith of our glorious Lord Iesus Christ, in respect of persons. But, to like or mislike, in respect of the man, is to haue it in respect of persons. But hee hauing thus professed that generall reason whereby he is setled in his persuasion commeth afterwardes in the same booke to other particular reasons. His first reason is this. God is

Orthodoxarum explicat. li. 3.

De gram. & libero arbit. li. 5. cap. 1.

Iam. 2. 1.

Cap. 9.

saide

saiue manie times to reward the workes of the Infidels, but God will not reward that which is sinne, therefore not all the workes of Infidels are sinne. If I should examine the particular proofes that hee bringeth of his first proposition, the weakenesse thereof will soone appeare. For he must proue that the workes of infidels are rewarded of God. For proofe whereof his first example is of the midwiues, that came to the women of Israel in their trauel in Aegipt, of whom the Scripture giueth testimony that they feared God, both in that verie place, and before also. Why then doth he reckon them amongst infidels. Then also the reward which he saith was promised to them, the best learned in the Hebrew tongue, apply not to the Midwiues, but to the Israelites of the increase of their families. The second example is out of Ezechiel where God promiseth to giue Nabuchad-nezar and his army as their wages, Aegipt for their seruice which they did against Tyre. Which seruice against Tyre, if maister Bellarm. can commend in Nabuchad-nezar as a good worke, wherein hee had only regarde vnto his owne cruell and proud affection, he will hardlie finde anie euill. His third and last place out of Daniel, wherein Daniel giueth counsel to Nabuchad-nezar to redeeme his sinnes by being good to the poore, it is not very pertinent to the purpose, and I shal (God willing) haue more fit place afterwards to speake of it. Although therefore it doth easily appeare that his *maior* is not proued by him, yet I will confesse, that God is saide to reward such men, in respect that he giueth good successe to them, and prospereth them, to set forth by them his owne glorie: Alluding vnto the wages that seruantes haue for their worke. Who although they bee not alwaies of the best, yet good reason they should haue their wages for their worke. The *minor* is, that God will not reward sinne. I grant in that respect that it is sinne hee will not. But in euerie action, there are to be considered manie things.

The first argument to proue that all the infidels workes are not sinne.

Exod. 1. 21. 27.

Ezech. 27. 28, 29.

Daniel 4. 24.

First,

First, the deede, as in this that Nabuchad-nezar did fight against Tirus: Secondly, the manner how, and with what affection: with a cruel and proud minde, and not with such compassion and pittie as wee ought to haue in correcting of others: Thirdly, the ende is to be regarded, as, whether he did especially respect Gods glorie, or rather, as indeede he did, to subdue them vnto his owne dominion.

Nowe therefore true it is that God rewardeth not sinne. And yet hee manie times rewardeth and commendeth that action, which himselfe turneth to his glorie, and the executing of his good will, which yet in him that doth it, in respect of his euil affection, and wrong ende that hee looked vnto, in doing of it, is sinne. But the sinne it selfe, he is so farre from rewarding, that he vterly condemneth it, and him that delighteth therein. Maister Bellarmines second argument is, that Infidels doe, or can doe good workes: therefore, not all their workes are sinne. That they do or can doe good workes, marke howe hee proueth. If yee salute your brethren only, what singular thing doe you? Doth not also the Ethnickes likewise? Bee yee therefore perfect, &c. Now Maister Bellarmine must reason thus. The heathen can salute one another, therefore they can doe a good worke. As strong a reason, as if I should say, Iudas saluted his Maister: therefore he did a good worke. Againe, the Gentiles that haue not the lawe, doe by nature the things of the lawe. Therefore they doe a good worke, and so not al they doe is sinne. These bald prooles, doe shew that maister Bellarmine hath but a barren matter in hande. For by doing the lawe, he meaneth not that which the Apostle calleth fulfilling of the law, for the Gentiles not regenerate cannot doe that. But that they doe that which the lawe commaundeth after some sort, but not in such manner as is commaunded. And therefore hee saith they doe the worke of the law. But that worke of the law, because they

Arg. 2.

Matth. 5. 47.

Mat. 26. 49.

Rom. 2. 14.

Rom. 13. 8.

doe

doe it not, with such a minde, and to such an end as they ought, therefore it is sinne in them. And that the apostle himselfe in that place sheweth. For his endeuour is to proue, them to be vnexcusable by reason of their sinne, although they had not the law written deliuered to them, because they had by nature the substance which he calleth the worke of the law, written in their harts: yea, and framed very often their external actions according to the same and yet performed not that holy obedience that they should. Now who wil grant such an argument: The Gentiles do the external law: therefore there is not sinne in al their actions. For to make our actions voide of sinne, it is not sufficient that we keepe the external law, but they must bee good workes well done. Neither doth Chrysostome when he saith, the Gentiles without the lawe did all the thinges of the lawe, meane all the circumstances of the law which maister Bellarmine falsly gathereth, but onlie all those thinges that externally the lawe hath commanded, as maie appeare by his owne wordes a little before, who saith, The greeke shall be set before thee, appearing to be a doer of those things that are in the law. Marke, he saith not doing, but appearing or seeming to do. Because he doth that concerning the law that appeareth to the eie, and is externall. But with a sanctified affection, or to a holy end, he that is not sanctified cannot doe it. As for the testimonies out of the fathers, whereby he doth proue, that the Gentiles & the vnregenerate, may haue excellent vertues, it is nothing to this question. For when we saie, that the Infidels haue not in them any thing that is good: our meaning is, that there is in them no worke so perfect, but that it hath sinne in it. And that this is true, saint Hierome (who seemeth to speake for him most effectually) doth manifestly proue. Workes (saith he) because they are done by the body, are neuer without fault. Which if it be true in al workes, then can it not be but true in the workes of them, which themselues are most faulty, such as

Serm. 5. in cap. 2. ad Rom.

Argument 3. out of the fathers.

In eccl. ca. 7.

are

are the Infidels. Lastly, master Bellarmine hath in that place two reasons. The first is this. If works done without faith or Gods speciall helpe, be sinne, they are sinne, either because they are not done to the right end, which is Gods glorie: or because they proceed from a sinfull man: or because those morall workes are not of proportion with the strength of nature: or lastly, because these workes that are good are too hard, both in respect of the rebellion of the flesh, and the tyranny of Sathan. But in none of these respects they are sinne: therefore they are not sinne. Which his argument briefly thus I answer. That his *minor* proposition is vtterly false, and directly against that which the Apostle saint Paul writeth in the Epistle to the Romanes, of the Gentiles, shewing how God gaue them vp, because when they knew God, they glorified him not as God. Wherein the Apostle sheweth how wickedly the Gentiles abuse that their knowledge, whereby they should be moued to glorifie God. And in that he denieth that they can be accounted sinfull, because they proceede from sinfull man. What doth hee else, but giue the lie to our Sauiour Christ himselfe, who hath plainely saide, that an euil tree cannot bring forth good fruit And all the sophistrie that master Bellarmine hath, can not salue this sore. For it is impossible to gather grapes of thistles: for that he speaketh of the proportion, betweene the worke and the strength of nature, it would be too long heere to examine. Lastly, whereas hee accounteth the tyranny of Sathan, and subiection to their owne lustes, not to be sufficient to make their worke sinfull: let him see how hee can answer, not S. Paul onely, who saith, that such are seruants to sin, but also our sauiour Christ, who telleth the Iewes, that vnlesse the Sonne made them free, they could not be free. Then I pray you, what good works, wholy void of sin can such worke as serue so bad a M. as is sin? His second argument taken from reason, is of the absurdity he imagineth to be in our doctrine. Himself reasoning most absurdly, thus.

Argum. 2. from reason

Rom. 1. 21.

Matth. 7. 18.

Rom. 6. 17.

Ioh. 8. 36.

If the Infidels in doing their good workes, do sinne, it is better for them not to do those workes, than to do them: but so to say is most absurde. That to say it is better not to do those externall good workes than to doe them, wee will with master Bellarmine willingly confesse. But how doeth hee proove his *maior*, namely, that it is better to leaue them vndone, than to doe them? Because in doing them (saieth he) they sinne, in not doing them, they sinne not. I see Master Bellarmine hath forgotten that which in an other place hee telleth vs, that a man sinneth aswell in not doing that hee should, as in dooing that hee shoulde not. And therefore Master Bellarmine saieth falsly, that in not doing such workes as occasion is offered, they should not sinne. I might therefore conclude with that golden sentence alleadged out of saint Augustine by the master of sentences, The whole life of Infidels is sinne, and there is nothing good, without the chiefe good. Where is want of knowledge of the eternall trueth, euen in the best manners, is but counterfait vertue: but that I think it very necessary to shew how violently master Bellarmine seeketh to wrest from the true sence, that euident testimony of our Sauiour Christ, That an euill tree can not bring foorth good fruit: which, because it is applied to sundry purposes, as himselfe confesseth, it is plaine, that it is a generall sentence, both in the one place and the other, applied as occasion serueth. And for the meaning of it, to the ende it shoulde not seeme to proove that, for the which it is alleadged in this question, Master Bellarmine hath three answeres to that place. First, that as a good tree doeth not alwayes bring foorth good fruit, so an euill tree doth not alwayes bring foorth euill fruit: but commonly, or, for the most part, so it is. Which answere of his, doth flatly deny that which Christ affirmeth, Christ saith, An euill tree can not bring foorth good fruit: yes, saith Master Bellarmine (by your leaue) but it may sometime. Euery tree is known by the fruit (saith Christ:)

De amiss. grat. li. 1. ca. 3

Lib. 2. dist. 41

Luc. 6. 43. & matth. 7. 18

De gratia & lib. arbit. lib. 5 cap. 10.

not

not so, (saith master Bellarmine) for sometimes the fruit may be good, although the tree be euill. Is not this a sawcie mate, so impudently and openly to controll the Author of all trueth? His second answer, if we will trust his owne report, is a plaine solution of the argument. And it is this, that this euil tree is the euil wil of man. Which answer he would faine father vpon saint Augustine, but in the place alledged there is no such matter. I remember that S. Augustine in another place doth say, that this euill tree, is a man of an euill will, but not the euill will it selfe. Well, thus master Bellarmine granteth this place to bee true, that an euill tree, that is, lust, or a man that worketh according to lust, cannot bring foorth good fruit. But first master Bellarmine hath falsified S. Augustine, as I haue saide: Secondly, he expoundeth this place otherwise than saint Ierome and Theoph. doe: for they vnderstand it euen as we doe, that an euill man, whilest he is euill, can not bring foorth good fruit, but being conuerted hee may. Yea the wordes themselues are very plaine, that our Sauior Christ meant it not of the euil wil that is in man, but of the man himselfe: in that he addeth, A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth good, and an euill man out of the euill treasure of his heart bringeth foorth euill. Yet then this place alleadged proueth substantially, that Infidelles or heathen men whilest they continue so, can not do any workes that shall be perfectly good or voide of sinne. His third and last answere to this place is this. The euill tree (saith he) is an euil man, and the good fruit is a meritorious worke. And after this meaning he thus answereth the place. An euill man cannot do a meritorious worke. Is not this a notable abusing of Gods word, after his owne pleasure to wrest and wring it? what one word inuceth him to dreame here of meritorious workes? Nay the words confute him mightily: for it is said, An euil tree bringeth forth euill fruit. Euill, I say, not onely, not meritorious. And the tree is knowen

De actis cum fol. Manich. lib. 2. cap. 4.

De gratia Christi ca. 18

Luc. 6. 45.

Matth. 7. 17.

by the fruit. The fruit then must be bad that must shew a bad tree. And therefore this answere of M. Bellar. is, as are the rest too foolish. But S. Augustine expoundeth it so, if you will trust M. Bellar. but examine the places by him alleadged, and there is no such thing in them. So smal a matter it is for M. Bellar. to abuse his readers at his pleasure, by falsifying the fathers. And now the latter of these places which he falsly hath alleadged, for the confirmation of his vntrue assertion, I truely apply to the confuting of this their vngodly doctrine, vsing only the words of S. Augustine. If a heathen man who liueth not by faith, doeth cloath the naked, deliuer the distressed, cure the wounded, bestow his riches vpon honest friendship, will not by tormentes be brought to beare false witnes, I demād of thee (saith S. Augustine to Iulian the Pelagian) whether he do these good works wel or euil? For if they being good, yet he doth them euill, thou canst not deny, but that he sinneth that doth any thing euill. But because thou wilt not say that he sinneth in doing this, thou wilt doubtles say, that both he doth good things, and he doth them well. Now marke S. Augustines conclusion vpon these wordes, If it bee so, an euill tree may bring forth good fruits, which thing the truth it selfe saith it cannot be. Thus much out of S. Augustine, not only to shew how falsely he is alleadged for proofe of M. Bellarm. senceles assertion, but also to let it be seene, how he iumpeth with vs in this doctrine that the Godlesse cannot doe the worke, that shall be without sinne. Therefore to conclude this question as Saint Augustine did to the Pelagians, so doe I saie to our aduersaries. How can it bee that you should not seeme, either to be mery or mad in these disputations, who praise the fruite of barren trees? Whose fruites are either none, or if they be euill, they are not to be praised.

De gra. Christi cap. 18. 19 Cont. Iulianum Pelag. li. 4. cap. 3.

Aug ibidem.

Of

Of Baptiſme, whether it doe extinguiſh and kil in vs originall ſinne, or not.

CHAP. 23

THE PROTESTANTS

WEe confeſſe, that in Baptiſme is ſealed vp and aſſured vnto vs, the couenant that God made with vs, for the forgiueneſſe of our ſins. Whereby we are alſo taught, that if we be Gods children, we be ingrafted into Chriſt, and planted in him, to the mortification of the olde man, the whole body of ſinne, that hauing put on the new man, *which after God is created in righteouſneſſe and true holineſſe*, wee may increaſe more and more in all ſpirituall graces, ſtriuing alwayes to attaine to that perfection, which in this life wee cannot haue, though we faine would obtaine the ſame.

Ephes. 4. 22 24

THE PAPISTS

BVt our aduerſaries will haue ſin in Baptiſme, not pardoned onely, but aboliſhed alſo, and taken away, ſo as nothing that is indeed ſin, remaineth in them that are baptized: Contrary to our owne experience, whereby we finde that we haue need continually to ſay, Forgiue vs our treſpaſſes: *contrary to the manifeſt wordes of Saint* Iohn, *who telleth vs*, If we ſay we haue no ſinne, wee deceiue our ſelues, and trueth is not in vs. *And contrary to the confeſſions of* Dauid, Daniel, *and all the godly, who acknowledge their owne miſerie, by reaſon of ſinne, and reſt onely vpon Gods mercie.*

Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 5.

1. Ioh. 1. 8.

Pſal. 32. 5. Pſa. 130. 3. & pſa. 143. 2. Dan. 9.

Although I haue ſpoken before of Baptiſme, yet muſt I here, as occaſion is offered, teach, that after baptiſme, ſinne is not altogether killed, no not in the faithfull. So

Chap. 11.

that as before in the laſt chapters, I haue ſhewed the corruption of our nature to be ſuch, as that in our ſelues we finde nothing but occaſion of death: So nowe we may ſee, what remedie God of his mercie hath prouided for the ſame: namely, that ſeeing we haue in this life continually, the law of the fleſh rebelling againſt the lawe of the ſpirit, and leading vs captiues to the lawe of ſinne, which is in our members: we ſhould haue our eſpeciall comfort, in that bleſſednes which the apoſtle ſaint Paul ſaieth is deſcribed by the prophet Dauid, euen the imputation of righteouſneſſe. Becauſe the prophet ſaieth. Bleſſed are they whoſe iniquities are forgiuen, and whoſe ſinnes are couered. Bleſſed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not ſinne. So that the imputation of righteouſneſſe which our aduerſaries cannot well like of, is taught vs by Paul, and confirmed by Dauid. Which imputation of righteouſneſſe wee ſtand in neede of, becauſe that euen the goodly whileſt here they liue, do finde themſelues to be farre from that perfection which they ſhould haue, and would wiſh. For (as ſaith ſaint Bernard) although their be no doubt, but that ſin is crucified with Chriſt, yet was it ſuffered, though not to raigne, yet to dwell in the apoſtle himſelfe whileſt he liued. And therefore the ſame ſaint Bernard in another place truly ſaieth, O only happie man indeed is he, to whom the Lord imputeth not ſin. For in whom there is no ſin, there is none. For all haue ſinned, and ſtand in need of the glorie of God. And by and by after he ſaieth. Not to ſinne is only Gods righteouſneſſe but mans righteouſneſſe, is Gods mercie. And in this reſpect he reckoneth Malachy in the ſermon before alledged a happie man, becauſe by death he was freed from this peril of ſinning: Alluding to the cloke of Helia, & Putiphars wife. Helias (ſaith he) hath left his cloke, he needeth not to feare. He cannot now be touched, much leſſe holden of the adultres, meaning of fleſhly or ſinfull luſts. S. Aug. alſo vpon the 32. Pſal. ſeemeth to be of that mind: So that

Rom. 7. 23.

Rom. 4. 6.

Pſal. 32. 1, 2

In tranſ. S. Malac. ſer.

Super cant. ſerm. 23.

Rom. 3. 23.

Gen. 39. 12. 4 kin. 2, 13.

we must needs acknowledge the complaint which the apostle hath made to be iust and true, that God hath shut vp all in vnbeliefe, that he might haue mercie on all. And therfore although in baptisme the forgiuenesse of sinne is sealed vp vnto vs, yet that bitter roote, is not vtterly pulled out, but still euen the godlie sigh and grone, because they sinne and transgresse. But let vs see howe they proue that after baptisme there remaineth no sinne. The scriptures say our sinnes are washed, cleansed, taken away, blotted out, therefore they are not onely not imputed, but also vtterly abolished. Wittingly and wilfully they indeuour to deceyue the ignorant, and would make them beleeue, that wee acknowledge no other benefite, but only that our sinnes are not imputed vnto vs. But wee (as is before shewed) are by baptisme assured, not only of the forgiuenesse of sinnes, but also of the sanctification of the spirite, knowing that He that is dead in sinne, must not liue therein. We say therefore that a man is not iustified onely, but sanctified also. What then? must this sanctification be done at that instant as wee are baptised? The church of Rome teacheth vs so. But saint Paul sayth, Wee all beholde as in a mirrour, the glorie of the Lord with open face, and are chaunged vnto the same Image, from glorie to glorie. Marke, that hee sayth this change is not all at once, but that it increaseth from glorie to glorie. Againe, the inward man is renued dayly. Which thing saint Bernard most notably confesseth. In the fall of the first man wee are all fallen: And that vpon a heape of stones, and in the mire: So that wee are not defiled onely, but wounded also and sore bruised. Wee may quickly be washed, but we must haue much a do, before we can be healed. And afterwards confessing this washing to be in baptisme, yet he complaineth that the beastly motions are not tamed, neither that the itch of that sore may yet be abidden. By the which motions & itch he meaneth ye verie thing, which in his sermon at ye death of Malac. before

Rom. 11. 32

Art. 1. Bellar. de. sacram. bapt. li. 1. cap. 13.

Rom. 6. 2.

2. Cor. 3. 18

2. Cor. 4. 16.

serm. in cœna domini.

alledged, he calleth ſinne. But nowe let vs examine the
Pſal.50 particular proofes of this argument. Dauid ſayth, Blot out mine iniquitie, waſh me throughly. Therefore all ſinne is taken away in Baptiſme. Dauid had receyued the Sacrament of Circumciſion long before hee prayed thus, which was to them in ſtead of our Baptiſme. And now hauing ſinned long after, he maketh this prayer, that God would either pardon his ſinne, or worke in him the ſubduing of the ſame, or both. But this proueth not, that ſinne is vtterly ſubdued in baptiſme: and that hee ſhould
Micah.7.18. proue. Againe, the Prophet Micah ſaieth, that God taketh away iniquitie. We graunt it, that hee taketh away iniquitie by forgiuing vs our ſinnes, and alſo by killing ſinne in vs by little and little, and ſo ſubduing it in the meane time, that it vtterly preuaile not againſt vs. But this proueth not that ſinne is alreadie altogether vanquiſhed. Againe, Iohn the Baptiſt ſaide, Behold the Lambe
Iohn 1.29. of God that taketh away the ſinne of the worlde. This alſo, to our ſingular great comfort we confeſſe and acknowledge, that he taketh away both the condemnation or curſſe, and alſo the guiltineſſe or corruption of our ſinne: And therefore hee is truely ſayde to take away the ſinne of the worlde. Maſter Bellarmine ſhould proue, that this is perfectly done in baptiſme, ſo that no ſinne after baptiſme remaineth, but this proueth no ſuch matter. No not one of all theſe places make any mention of baptiſme. Only they teſtifie, that either ſinne is, or the godly would haue it abolished, which we alſo confeſſe and deſire. But how, or when it is taken away, there is not any mention in the places alledged. Let vs then come to the laſt proofe of this argument. The apoſtle ſpeaking of Chriſts loue to the church
Ephe.5.25 26,27 his ſpouſe, ſayth: He gaue himſelfe for it, that he might ſanctifie it and cleanſe it, by the waſhing of water in the worde: that he might make it vnto himſelfe a glorious church, not hauing ſpot or wrinkle, &c. Now if I ſhould
Ezec.47. expound this place, by the 47. Chapter of Ezechiel,

vnto

vnto the which the apostle may verie well seeme to allude, I knowe this exposition would be thought newe, and singular. But yet as this exposition hath nothing in it against the rule of faith, so by saint Ieremis interpretation of that place of Ezechiel, it seemeth to be warranted. For by the waters mentioned in that place, hee vnderstandeth that which our sauiour Christ taught, as also both hee and Primasius doe expound this place of the apostle, As water (say they) washeth the bodie, so teaching doeth cleanse the soule. And so the apostle doth seeme to expound himselfe, when hee sheweth that this washing is in the worde. And thus this place serueth no more for his purpose then the rest. For none of them proue that baptisme taketh away all sinne. But admit that saint Paule speaketh in that place of baptisme, yet this place will not serue to proue that they would haue it. For then the apostle teacheth vs, how the church of Christ, I say, that complete and whole bodie of Christ is sanctified, namely by himselfe in the worde, whereof baptisme is the sacrament. So that therein appeareth how, or rather by what meanes, the bodie of Christ, his wife and spouse shall be without spot and wrinkle, but not in what maner, or in what compasse of time, euerie particular member of this bodie shall be freed from sinne, which is in controuersie amongst vs. But to ende this first argument. As this doctrine of the Romish Church sauoureth of Pelagianisme: so master Bellarmine and his fellowes borrow weapons of the Pelagians to fight withall. For saint Augustine doth note this place amongst those which the Pelagians did alledge to proue that man may be without sinne. But more plainly writing to Boniface, hee writeth thus. The Pelagians doe say that men by baptisme are perfectly renued, and bring for proofe the witnesse of the Apostle to the Ephes. 5. Not one ape is then liker another, than are the Pelagians and Papists, both in their doctrine, and in their proofe of it. But of all such testimonies I may say with saint August.

Ierom & Primasius vpon Ephes. 5.

De perfect. iust. cont. Celest. Lib. 4. cap. 3

Some

De perfect. iust. cont. Celest.

Some of them exhort them that do runne, that they run as they shoulde, some other shewe to what ende they should runne. And thus much for his first argument. His

Arg. 2. of M. Bellarmine.

second argument is this. The Scriptures say, that our spots, defilings, or pollutions, and our iniquities are taken away, therefore in baptisme all sinne is taken away. For by these wordes is signified (saith hee) the verie corruption of sinne. His argument is not good. For we confesse his antecedent, namely, that these things are taken away, as before hath beene shewed. But it followeth not thereupon, that by baptisme all sinne is taken away: wee acknowledge also that Christ is made vnto vs Sanctification: but in deed this holinesse wee say is not in this life

1. Cor. 1.30

perfected. Begun it is in Gods children, which walke not

Rom. 8.1

after the flesh, but after the spirit. But doe what we can, we had need alwayes to pray as our Saviour Christ taught his apostles, Forgiue vs our trespasses, as saint

De perfect. iust. Celest. De Amiss. gratiæ li. 5 cap. 8

Augustin doth often teach vs, and namely in the end of his booke of the perfection of Justice: which place I the rather note, because most vntruly master Bellarmine writeth, that saint Augustine in that place saith, That the vnwilling motions of concupiscence, are so farre from being sinne, that a man neede not for the forgiuenesse of them say, Forgiue vs our trespasses: But saint Augustine affirmeth the contrary. For hauing alleadged that place of S.

1. Iohn 1.8

Iohn, If we say we haue no sin, we deceiue our selues, and the truth is not in vs: then he addeth, that if any will say, that the apostle speaketh there of concupiscence, & that concupiscence if it be not consented vnto, is not sinne, He putteth a subtill difference, which I would haue our aduersaries to marke, that they may know that S. Aug. counteth that but a subtill shift. And then he sheweth that we do sometimes, somewhat consent to the lusts of that sinne, because otherwise we needed not to say, Forgiue vs our trespasses. So that we see saint Augustine maketh that a reason to proue, that concupiscence often preuaileth, because wee

haue

haue neede so to pray. And thus we see how cleane contrarie to all shew of trueth, master Bellarmine falsifieth saint Augustine. Which I would wish the simple to consider of: For many times either himselfe is so deceiued, or else hee seeketh to deceiue his Reader. But to returne to his argument, this we say, that euen here in this life, Gods children begin to haue a mislike of sin, & a loue of godlines, yea, and also by the assistance of Gods good spirit increase therin. But this shal not be perfected in vs, vntill we be deliuered from this bodie of death, and that made the apostle to crie out as he did. And therefore saint Augustine saith, that none in this life can be without sinne, yet sinne is diminished in the life of them that do profit, but consumed it is in the life of the perfect: meaning after this life, when corruption hath put on incorruption, who then would allowe of this reason. The verie filth and corruption of sin, is taken away, therefore it must needes be taken away here by baptisme. Whereas on the contrarie, we are called children of God, because at the first, not in faith onely, but in life also we are beginners and weake, and must growe stronger and stronger in both. His third argument. In circumcision the flesh onely was cut away, not by imputation onely. Master Bellarmine verie vnskilfully doeth match togither things not of like nature. For as Circumcision is the cutting off the foreskinne, so is baptisme the washing of the bodie. But this is nothing to the effect of the Sacrament, to tel vs what the externall thing doth of it selfe. Out of that that hath beene said it is not hard to answer his 4. 6. 7. 8, and 9. arguments, if wee remember that God beginneth in vs holines here, which shal be perfected elsewhere. But in the meane time, for his Christs sake, hee accepteth our imperfect holinesse for perfect, and forgiueth, euen the many and great sinnes of his children. As for his fift argument, which in another place he saith that it seemeth vnanswerable, euen in that respect that he trusteth so much in the strength of it, I would not omit.

Rom. 7
Vpon Iohn tract. 41

Arg. 3. Bella.

De iustificat. li. 1. cap. 7.
Rom. 5. 19.

And

And it is this, As by one mans diſobedience, many were made ſinners, ſo by the obedience of one, many are made iuſt. But ſaith he, by Adams diſobedience we were made indeede ſinners, and not only by imputation. Therefore by Chriſt we are not by imputation only made righteous, but alſo indeed. What if I ſhould anſwere maſter Bellarmine, that this word As, doth not ſignifie the likeneſſe in the maner of iuſtifying vs, but in the act it ſelfe. Namely, that many were partakers of Adams ſinne, and many were made righteous by Chriſt. For this word As, doth not alwaies import an agreement or likenes in euery point. Among many examples that may be alleadged, this
Ioh.20.21. one may ſerue for all. As my father ſent me, ſo ſende I you. But God ſent him from heauen, to take vpon him a nature that he had not, with fulnes of al power and graces: the apoſtles were not ſo ſent. So that we ſee that maſter Bellarmine can not ſoundly reaſon becauſe of this worde As, that this contrariety betweene the firſt and the ſecond Adam, muſt hold in euery point. But what neede we to ſtand vpon ſo narrowe a point? Becauſe the argument pleaſeth him ſo wel, I wil yeeld to it, and confeſſe it to bee moſt true. And yet ſhall it nothing helpe maiſter Bellarmine his cauſe. But in truth the ſumme of the doctrine
De peccat. mer. & remiſſ. li. 1. cap. 28. that is taught in that place as Saint Auguſtine doth gather, it is this, That as al in Adam die in whom al ſinned, ſo they that are quickned, are quickned by Chriſt, in whom they are all iuſtified. But if hee will needes that this making of vs righteous whereof the apoſtle ſpeaketh, ſhould be by our ſanctification, I haue ſhewed that it cannot heere be perfect. But whenſoeuer that ſhall bee perfected in vs,
1.Cor.4.7. we muſt aſcribe the glory thereof vnto Chriſt. For, what haue we that we haue not receiued? And that is the meaning of theſe words heere, That by him many are made righteous. But becauſe that there is alſo another way wherby we are made righteous, namely, in that our ſinnes are not imputed vnto vs, and that Chriſts merit is accounted,

ted to vs as ours: and that our aduersaries wil in no wise heare vs speake of that: they shall yet heare how Saint Barnard writeth, euen alluding vnto the wordes from whence this vnanswerable argument is drawen. What (saith he) could man the seruant of sinne, and bond-slaue of Sathan doe, to recouer righteousnes lost? Anothers righteousnes was assigned vnto him, because he lacked his owne. And then alluding to these wordes of S. Paul. Why should not righteousnes come from another, seeing guiltines came from another? It is one that maketh vs sinners, and another that iustifieth from sinne. The one in his seede, the other in his bloud. Is there sinne in the seed of the sinner, and is not righteousnes in Christs bloud? And that we may know how he accompteth himselfe made righteous by Christ, he addeth If the fault conueied to me is mine, why should not the righteousnes giuen to me be mine? And verily that is safer for me that is giuen me, then that is bred in me. Many things he hath in that place to this end, wherby it appeareth that he knew his owne righteousnes would not serue his turne, and therfore that he reposed his trust in Christ his righteousnes imputed to him, which he calleth anothers righteousnes. Epist. 190.

I might also let you see how substantially Fisher sometime bishop of Rochester proueth this. Christ, saith he, did say to some, Thy sinnes are forgiuen thee, therefore no sinne remaineth. But his owne friendes are ashamed of such arguments. For we confesse as our creede teacheth vs forgiuenesse of sinnes. But he should proue that wee are also so sanctified, that whilest heere we liue we be without sinne. And that his argument cannot doe. Thus then wee see, that although we haue in baptisme the promise of remission of all our sinnes sealed vp vnto vs: yet we cannot say, I haue made mine heart cleane, I am cleane from sinne. Prou. 20. 9.

That

That wee haue not of our ſelues free will or power to deliuer our ſelues from ſinne.

CHAP. 24.

THE PROTESTANTS

OVr nature then being thus corrupted, and *our ſinne hanging ſo faſt on,* as before I haue taught in the three laſt chapters: we muſt needes confeſſe that *when we would doe good, euill is preſent with vs.* The light of our vnderſtãding is ſo darkened, that not only *A naturall man perceiueth not the things of the ſpirit of God:* but euen the beſt men, haue great need continually with the Prophet *Dauid* to pray: *O Lord teach me thy ſtatutes, Giue me vnderſtanding.* As for our affections, they are ſo froward, that they wil not be ſubdued to the ſpirite of God, but doe rather follow, the flattering follies of inticing ſinne. Chriſtes yoke we account too ſore, his burden too heauy, ſo that if wee will come to Chriſt,

Heb. 12. 1.

Rom. 7. 21.

1. Cor. 2. 14.

Pſal. 119. 12. 34.

THE PAPISTS

BVt the Church of Rome will not heare of it, that Adam *by his tranſgreſſion robbed both himſelfe and vs, of this free will to good, they will not haue it quite loſt or extinguiſhed. It needeth, ſaie they, but to be* ſtirred vp, & holpen, and then we maie conuert our ſelues to iuſtifie our ſelues, and haue in our owne libertie ſome part of our ſaluation. *Yea this corrupt eſtate of man euen before his regeneration, they compare to a man who is ſo hindered by fetters that he cannot goe but coulde goe well enough if hee were not fettered: Euen ſo man hauing theſe bondes looſed wherein he was tied, hath as free a will to doe good, as euer had* Adam *before he fell (for as I haue ſaide it needeth but to be ſtirred vp & holpen.) Yea they are not aſhamed to affirme,*

Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 6. can. 5.

Ibidem. ca. 5.

Andra. Orth. expl. li. 4.

Andra. Orth. expli. li. 4.

Andra. ibid.

THE PROTESTANTS

Ioh. 6.44. Luc.18,17. Christ to serue and obey him we cannot *vnlesse the father draw vs*. And if with the prodigall sonne, we woulde but thinke to returne to our father againe,

2.Cor.3.5. yet *we are not sufficient of our selues to thinke any thing* (that is good) *as of our selues*. So that wee must pray, not only, that

Psalm.80. Psa.139.24. Psal.175. Psal.87,28. God will *Turne vs*, but also that he will *leade vs in the way for euer*. *And staie our steps in the path, that our feete slide not*, and *confirme* (euen vnto the end) *that which he hath begun in vs*: acknowledging the beginning of all good, the continuance and ending in the same, to be from him only,

Psal.119.36. Psal.51.15. who only can *Incline our heart vnto his testimonies*, and *open our lippes, that our mouth may shewe forth his praise*, and *direct our steps in his word*.

Psa.119.133 Phil.2,13. *For it is God that worketh in vs both the will and the deede, of his good pleasure*. Which will to doe good, when he of his greate mercy hath wrought in vs, by his spirit of regeneration, wee con-

THE PAPISTS

firme, that partly free will and partly grace, are the efficient cause of applying the minde to goodnes, diuiding and parting that woorke, which God only doth challenge to himselfe, betweene God and man. If then we wil beleeue them, mans free will is not lost. No, he hath by nature strength to doe wel, and freedome of will to please God: were it not that the corruption of nature, were as it were fetters, to hinder him in his holy obedience S. Paul belike said not truely when he said we were dead in sin, We were but asleepe, say they.

Eph.2.5. *And what neede we be born againe, as Christ teacheth vs we must be. It is a needelesse matter say they. It will serue the turne if our old, euen our owne will bee but stirred vp and holpen. So that that renuing whereunto the Apostle so much exhorteth vs, is more then needeth. Yea our willes being so stirred vp & holpen, if we giue credite to that they teach, are frankely and freely mooued to good. What shoulde wee then care for that drawing without which*

Ioh.3.3.

Concil. Trid. Sess.6. cap.6. Bellar. de gra.li.arbit. li.1 cap.3. Iohn.6.44.

The Protestants.	The Papists
confesse to be good: but a free will it cannot be. Because that although *To will is present with me, yet I finde no means to performe that which is good.* Free therefore, that is to say able to performe the good that it would, it is not, but willing it may be, and ready to obey sincerely.	*which no man can come to Christ? And yet God saith he must take away our stony hearts, he must giue vs a hart of flesh, a soft heart that may receiue his graces euē a new hart, & a new spirit, for this old will not serue the turne.* Ezec. 36. 26.

Deg. 2. & 5. Arbit. 5. 14 Deg. 2.

Maister Bellarmines first argument whereby he will proue that man hath free will, is this in effect. We sinne not of necessity but of will, so that we may choose whether we will sinne or not, therefore we haue free will. It is false that he saith we sinne not of necessity but of will. For although that were true in Adam, in respect of his sinne that it was simply voluntary, for I speake not of Gods eternall decree: yet by reason of that corruption that we haue from him, and cleaueth vnto vs, Wee are so led captiue vnto the law of sinne, and haue in vs such a fountaine of sinne, that we may truely say with the apostle, we are carnall, and solde vnder sinne. And this necessity of sinning is in vs, by reason of that frowardnes of our will. Which although it be so reformed in the regenerate, that they haue a will to doe well: yet because the old man will dwell with vs, euen so long as we carry this mortal body: and the new man will neuer be wholy put on, vntill the old man be put off: there will euer be in vs a repining against good, & readines to euil. So that although it be true in some respect, that we sinne of will, because we are very readie & willing thereto, yet is our will drawen with the cordes or chaines of lust and concupiscence that it cannot but sinne. And therefore Saint Paul doth very aptly call concupiscence A law in the members, because of the necessity of obeying it.

Rom. 7. 23.

24.

And

And therefore on the contrary I may thus reason. The ungodly are led captiue vnto the law of sinne: therefore they can not chuse whether they will sinne or not: but because of their corruption they must sinne.

This second argument is this. If there be not free will in man, then is there no place for reward or punishment. For if, for the punishment of the wicked, we do confesse both that they haue free will to do euill, and also iustly deserue the punishment that is laide vpon them. Thus farre then we agree. And also for the other part which concerneth the godly, it is true, that if you take away free will, you take away the reward that the worke might merite or deserue. But we please Gods promise, not our deseruing, his mercy not our merit, as shall be shewed by Gods grace hereafter. For we know, that as here we haue no good thing in vs, but that were haue receiued it of his abundant grace: so hereafter wee shall haue no glorie, but of his onely mercy, Who hath kept vs by his power vnto saluation through faith. And therefore, although we be sinfull, and so can not deserue the reward that were looke for, yet God is faithfull, who hath promised: and therefore it is a righteous thing with him to giue vs rest with him. Thus then may I reason. The reward of our good workes is not giuen in any respect of our free will: therefore if free will be taken away, yet that reward is not taken away.

This third argument. If it were not for free will, all should be good, or all should be bad: yea, and that all alike good or euill. Which argument is answered by experience it selfe, and therefore needeth no long confutation. For themselues will confesse, that in the Iustified there is not free will, but a seruile will. And yet amongst them some were better, some worse. Yea some among them came so neare being good, that some Papists thought they might be saued. And yet free will they could not haue, because the Sonne hath not made them free.

Arg.4.ca.17 De corrept. & grat.cap.2

His fourth argument. Take away free will, and in vaine are exhortations, rebukings, praises, dispraises, commandements, councils, admonitions &c. Which argument S. August. answereth for vs: They are, that men may know what they should do. And as he writeth of the Lawe, that it is necessary to be giuen, although it cannot be kept: so wee may answere of these things that master Bellarmine speaketh of. His wordes are these: Why should not this perfection bee commaunded vnto men, although no man in this life attaine vnto it? For a man shall neuer runne well, that knoweth not which way to runne. And how shoulde that bee knowen, if by no precepts it should be shewed? Thus then I reason. Saint Augustine saith, that precepts must be giuen although they cannot be kept: therefore although man haue not free will to performe that is commaunded, yet commaundements are necessarie. And Saint Bernard saith, God doeth by that meanes humble vs. As for other vses of admonitions, I will not now speake of them: for I trust this is sufficient for answere to the argument.

De perfect. iustit. contra Celest.

In Cantic. serm. 30.

Which also is an answer vnto his fift argument which is this. In the scripturs many things are forbidden and commaunded, and without free will that were in vaine: which is all one with the fourth argument. But because master Bellarmine doeth proove this argument, and that very strongly (as himselfe saieth) because saint Augustine vseth that very reason to proove free will, I must needes speake a word of that place. Seeing therefore saint Augustine hath said in the place alleadged in the former argument, that precepts are needefull though they can not bee kept: And now he saith, if there be not free will, precepts are in vaine. It seemeth that there were some amongest them, to whome he writeth, that thought that Gods grace did so worke in men, that they shoulde doe nothing at all themselues (for he complaineth of some, that when grace was defended, thought free will was denied.) Therefore

Arg.5.ca.18

De gratia & lib.Arbit.c.2

Cap.2.

he

hee teacheth them, that although wee be made partakers of grace, yet we are not without: nay rather wee haue free wil. But what manner of free wil? Haue we that free will that hath power and strength to doe good, and abstaine from euil? No, Saint Augustine confesseth that to bee lost. Man not vsing well freewill, lost both himselfe and that. What then? A will freed from that bondage vnto sinne wherein it was. A will that nowe hath a loue and liking of that is good, and not altogither delighting in euill as before it did. And indeed in vaine are exhortations to them that are not so freed from euil, that they haue at the least a pleasure in good things. Well may exhortations and instructions be to their confusion, but to their comforte they shall not bee. This then is is the meaning of that place, that God speaketh to vs in vaine in the scriptures, if we be, but as stockes and stones, not hauing so much as a delight therein. and hauing this willingnes, God must also by his grace inable vs, or els we cannot fulfill our will. The first argument is like the rest. It hath no necessarie consequence. God maketh promise vnto vs vnder condition that we shal obey him, therefore either we are able to obey, or els it is saith Maister Bellarmine, a mockery, and not a promise. Not so Maister Bellarmine. For in such conditional promises, it is not declared what we can doe, but what we ought to doe, and what in respect of the excellency of our creation, may iustly be required of vs, and what we must doe before we can be perfect. And because Maister Bellarmine thinketh it so scornefull a thing, that God should make promise vnder such condition cannot bee performed of vs: I would he would consider with himselfe, where is the cause why we cannot performe it. Is it in good? No, for he requireth nothing of vs, but that hee gaue vs abilitie to doe, if wee had kept vs in that estate. Is it in our creation? No, we were made good. Is it in the lawe? But that is pure, iust, and holie. Is it then in our selues? Yea truely. For in Adam wee

In Enchirid. cap. 9.

Arg. 6. ca. 19.

are all ſinners, and by ſinne robbed of that power to keep the law, and performe ſuch conditions, as once before we had.

If then the impoſſibility of keeping the conditions, is by our owne fault, God may iuſtly require of vs that debt, which hee knoweth wee were able to pay, when firſt we became his debters. We ſee then, that it is neither a good argument, to ſay God promiſeth vpon condition, therefore wee can perfourme the condition: (for the condition doeth but ſhew, what we ought to doe, or what marke we muſt aime at, yea, and what wee muſt doe in the end) neither abſurd that he ſhould require that of vs now, which once we could haue performed, and might ſtill haue done, if wee had not our ſelues bin in fault. But thus wee might reaſon truely. God maketh vnto vs many and great promiſes if we obey him: therefore we muſt ſtriue to obey him, ſtriue (I ſay) by prayer, by meditating in Gods lawe, and by all godly exerciſes. And God would haue vs indeede, by ſuch meanes to ſtirre vp our ſelues to attaine to the promiſes. And becauſe the promiſes belong but to the godly, and not to the wicked, we will eaſily confeſſe, that there is in them a willingneſſe to obey. But yet not free will, becauſe it is hindred by tentations without and within themſelues, and by it owne weakeneſſe. So that, be they neuer ſo willing, yet they can not obey, but euen as they are led by Gods good grace. It is no great matter (ſaith Auguſtine) that God made his Sonne to ſhew the way, ſince hee hath made him the way it ſelfe, that thou mighteſt goe by him ruling thee, that goeth by himſelfe. For in deede wee can not walke alone in thoſe wayes, wee are as babes that cannot goe by themſelues.

In pſa. 109. enarrationc.

This ſeuenth argument, as alſo the eight argument, is (in a manner) the very ſame with the firſt, and neede not be anſwered againe. But yet I will touch that place of Deuteronomie, whereupon he eſpecially reſteth for the ſtrength of the ſeuenth argument: and for interpretation

Arg. 7. & 8. ca. 20. & 21. Deut. 30. 14.

whereof

whereof he inueieth against master Caluine. Moses saith, of God by Moses: The word is neere thee, euen in thy mouth, and in thy heart. By which words master Bellarmine saieth Moses telleth vs, that this woord is easie to keepe: and therefore, that we haue free will. M. Bellarmine is but too bolde in a bad cause, and too ready to speake more than hee can proone. That which he had said before, This commaundement is not hid from thee, neither farre off: he prooueth in this place, because it is in their mouth and heart, so that they need not seeke far to get it. The Thalbe paraphrase can finde no free wil in these words. Chrisost. expounds these words of the cõmandement, that it is easie to be had without trauell by sea or land, not once dreaming of the easines of performing or doing it: but most plainly saith Theophilact: Gods commaundement (O thou Iew) is before thy eies, neither shalt thou need that thou mayest find and inioy it, either to clime vp into heauen, or go down into the deepe. It is at hand, and nearer vnto thee: Beholde, it is euen in thy mouth, and in thy heart: For God by his lawe hath shewed thee all things. How impudently soeuer therefore master Bellarmine dare affirme, that Moses speaketh there of the easinesse of keeping Gods lawe: yet the circumstance of the text, and the iudgement of the Writers alleadged especially of Theophilact, is flat against him. And to that end doth the Apostle saint Paul apply it also to his purpose, speaking of iustification by faith.

Verse 11.

Chrysost. in Rom. ser. 17.

Vpon the Romanes the tenth.

Rom. 10. 8.

His ninth argument consisteth of two places of scripture. The first is out of that talke which God had with Caine, before he killed his brother Abel. Also vnto thee his desire shall bee subiect, and thou shalt rule ouer him.

Arg. 9. cha. 25

Gen. 4. 7.

But that this may be an argument for free will, master Bellarmine and others contend, that it should be read. The desire of it shalbe subiect vnto thee, and thou shalt beare rule ouer it. And so they proue that sinne shall be

subiect vnto Cain and he shall beare rule ouer it: Therefore he had free will. That manie of the fathers doe expound these words so, it cannot be denied. But not what they say is only to be regarded, but how they proue it: yea the Iesuites that wrote, the censure of Colen will be therein my warrant for they hauing condemned some of the auncient fathers to haue spoken hardly, because they accounted the workes of infidels, how good soeuer they seemed, to be but sinne, doe then fall to trie how their proofe will warrant their doctrine. So must I heere examine vpon what ground the fathers doe thus expound it. And this I need not feare to do. For themselues giue me leaue to examine that they say. If then saint Hillarie haue giuen vs a true rule to interprete the scripture, when he sayeth, The vnderstanding of that which is spoken, must be looked for of the wordes that go before, or of those that followe, Let vs see what interpretation is to bee gathered out of the circumstances of that place: that wee may with the Church receiue the fathers, but not with the fathers forsake the faith of the Church, as Vincentius Lirinensis warneth vs. First then, euen in respect of the verie Grammer, if the relatiue in both places must agree with the antecedent, then this worde (It) which is the relatiue in both places as they would haue it, or rather his or him, as we say, being of the Masculine Gender, which themselues cannot denie, the worde (Sinne) which is of the Feminine Gender, cannot bee the antecedent to those Relatiues, although it goe next them, which maister Bellarmine vnlearnedly affirmeth. And therefore that translation, and interpretation of the place, standeth not with the rules of Grammer. Secondly, the circumstances of the place, teach vs so much. Cain is angrie that his brothers sacrifice is accepted of, and his not: Therefore when God hath questioned with Cain of his anger, hee bringeth this as an argument to pacifie him, because that Cain being the elder brother, should still haue the pre-

In dialog. 3

Lib. 9. de trinit.

In Commonitor. contra haeres.

rogatiue

rogatiue of the elder brother: and Abell should bee subiect vnto him. And that this is the plaine and natural sense of the wordes, I proue by sundrie reasons. First, because in the former Chapter, God speaking of the subiection of Eue vnto Adam, as they cannot but confesse, vseth the selfe same wordes there, that are here vsed. And therefore by all likelihoode hee speaketh of the same matter also here, that there he did, howe Abell should be vnder his elder brother. Conferre the wordes together, you shall see them agree. Cap.3.16.

Secondly, how impertinenly had the promise of free will, beene made in that place vnto Cain, God hauing reiected his sacrifice, and knowing his furie towards his brother, yea not any one circumstance inducing thereunto. But thirdly their owne doctrine doeth strongly confute them. For if they that are not regenerate (as Cain) haue the power of their will, by their owne confession weakened, and so clogged that they cannot haue free wil to doe good, then this cannot be verified of sinne, howe could God say that the lust or desire of sinne should be vnder him, or that he should haue dominion ouer sinne, being a graceleslle, and cruel man. Yea, the euent did presently declare, that hee was subiect to sinne, and that sinne got the dominion ouer him. So that I cannot see how they can be excused, from seeking to make God a liar, that affirme that God there promised that Cain should subdue sinne, the euent being so plain contrary. Which because I know it to be farre from those godly fathers, I will rather thinke, that they did but allude vnto that place, then expound the words. And thus I trust it is plaine, that neither the rules of Grammer, nor the circumstances of the place, neither yet their owne doctrine of free will, can well stand with that interpretation that they doe bring. As for his second authoritie which is out of Ecclesiasticus, the booke it selfe, not being canonical, a necessarie argument cannot bee gathered out of the same. Eccle.15.14, 15,16.

And that man at the first had free will it can not bee

denied, and of that especially the place mentioned doeth intreat. Now certaine other arguments out of the scripture there are alledged, whereunto I will briefly make answer. The first out of Deuteronomie, where Moses hauing shewed them, how he hath deliuered to them Gods word (in obeying whereof is life, and in contempt of it death:) hee then addeth, Therefore choose life, that thou and thy seede may liue. Wherin Moses doth nothing else, but earnestly stirre vp the people, to endeuour to the vttermost of their power to serue God: Not shewing what they can effectually applie themselues vnto, by the power of their will, but what they should doe in respect of their duetie towardes God, or care of their owne good. As for that of Iosue, Choose you this day whom you will serue. When Iosue, who had good experience of the frailtie of the people, and their readinesse to serue other gods, had set before them the great mercies of God, in their mightie deliuerance and preseruation from many perils, the more strongly to tie them vnto God, hee putteth them to this choise, not because he would haue suffered them to haue worshipped strange gods, if themselues would, (for that had beene contrarie to the dutie, that God required of him being a magistrate) but to this ende, that themselues hauing made choise to serue God, might by this their owne voluntarie submitting themselues to God, bee vrged to serue him more sincerely, as by the 22. verse appeareth. And this choise also is rather what external profession they would be of, which is a matter in our owne power, rather then of the inwarde affection, which is the thing in controuersie betweene the Papists and vs. For this we denie, and they should proue, that wee are able by our free will to doe things that are truely good, and to eschewe the things that are euill. And that this choyse that they were put to, was what externall profession they would be of, the wordes themselues declare. Choose (sayeth hee) whether ye will serue the Gods which your fathers ser-

De grat. & liber. arbit. lib. 5. cap. 23

Deut. 30. 19.

Iosue. 24. 15.

ued.

ued, or the gods of the Amorites. I and my house will serue the Lorde. As if a man would say now, choose whether you will professe the Gospell or Poperie. His testimonie out of Ecclesiasticus, Who might offend and hath not offended? or doe euill, and hath not done euill? I maruell hee so much commendeth, thinking it vnanswerable. Whereas, if it proue any thing, it is but that which we neuer denied, namely that the wicked haue a free will to euill. Now that which he allegeth out of saint Paul, is too absurd: Neuertheless he that purposeth firmely in his heart that he hath no need, but hath power ouer his owne will, &c. What are these words to free will. The power þ here he speaketh of, is if he performe his purpose without inconuenience to his daughter, as may appeare not onely by Primasius, and Hierom. of this place, but also by his owne friend Thomas of Aquine, who sheweth that then he hath power of his owne will, when hee knoweth his daughter, hath a purpose to continue a virgine. So that in effect, this is his argument. His daughter doth not hinder his will for keeping her a virgin: therefore hee hath free will in himselfe to doe good, or eschew euill. Of the strength of which argument, let maister Bellarmines owne friendes consider. His last place out of the scriptures is verie like this. As euerie man wisheth in his owne heart, &c. He speaketh of the contribution to the Saints. You must (sayeth saint Paul) giue willingly. Therefore sayeth maister Bellarmine, you haue free will. Wee confesse that the regenerate haue a willingnes to do good, and eschew euill, and this the apostle would haue in them. But doeth this prooue that they haue free will? And thus farre for their arguments for free will out of the scriptures. Out of the fathers master Bellar. bringeth many prookes. And although there be iust cause, to suspect manie of them in this question, because they could not so easily forget that which in the schooles of philosophy they had learned: yet that it may appeare that they haue not so generall

Eccle. 31. 10

Primasius. Hieronimus. Tho. Aquin.

2. Cor. 9. 7.

nerall a consent as they bragge of, it is not amisse somewhat to looke into and to examine the proofes, that out of them they bragge. But maister Bellarmine would make a man afraide to heare his crackes. Hee braggeth alwayes that his armour is of the best proofe that can not bee pearced, his arguments such as can not be answered. And first commeth in Ignatius, whose wordes are so vnanswerable, that maister Bellarmine seeth no way but to denie the Authour. But let maister Bellarmine quiet him selfe, we will admit the authour. The effect of that he alledgeth out of the first place, is, that looke what men doe choose that they shal haue: and after, If a man do wickedly, he is a man of the diuell, so made not by nature, but by the will of his minde. Then let vs see his argument: Looke what men doe choose, they shall goe into the place of that they choose, whether it bee life or death, so sayeth Ignatius, therefore (saith maister Bellarmine men haue free will. The force of both his places is this, and the argument that can bee gathered out of the same: men haue will: ergo they haue free will. And are these his vnanswerable arguments. That which hee alledgeth out of Dionysius Areopagita, although hee make as great bragges of it, as hee did of the other: yet it neuer so much as mentioneth free will. In deed he saith, If a man might not resist sinne, hee were lesse to be blamed: But if hee that is good giue strength, which as the holy Scriptures teach, doeth giue things conuenient simplie to euerie man, &c. That God giueth conuenient strength to them which with humilitie seeke it, but what doth this gift of God proue that wee haue free will. It rather ouerthroweth it. For if we haue not strength but by his gift, then we haue it not in vs, or by free will. As for Clement of Rome, because himselfe dare not speake much for the trueth of that witnesse, I let him passe. Then commeth in Iustine the Philosopher and martyr, whose words for free will maister Bellarmine taketh to be so plaine, that he

Bellar. de grat. & lib. arbit. lib. 5. cap. 25.

Epist. de. mag.

De diuinis nominibus li. 4. cap. 4. part. 4.

he saieth maister Caluine neither doeth, nor can feigne anie thing, that will carrie any shewe of an answer. What neede we to feigne, Master Bellarmine, that haue the truth for our warrant. We leaue faigning to painters, poets, and papists, who loue alwayes to make a shew of that that is not. If we consider the occasions why the ancient fathers did write in such sort, their meaning will bee pliane enough. And that may appeare by Iustinus Martyr here alledged. He saith, I grant, That if men haue not free will to shunne euill and doe good, they are not to blame for that they doe, and deserue neither reward nor punishment. Thus in effect hee saieth in the places alledged. Apolog. ad senatum. Apol. ad Ant.

We neither denie the authour in this place to be Catholike, nor his woordes (in his sense to be true. But because there were some that beeing deceyued with that which the Stoikes taught, concerning that fatall necessitie whereby all things were done, as though man could not choose but do the euill that he doeth, and that he were by this fatall necessitie compelled thereto, in respect of the necessarie consequence of causes, and thereby made man to haue nothing to doe in the workes that himselfe did, but that hee were euen forced thereto without his owne will, as stone or wood is laide in the house, onelie at the pleasure of the workeman, without anie disposition in themselues one way or other: because (I say) that some hereby did denie all will or inclination in man to good or euill, as not onely Simon Magus, and the Manicheis of whom maister Bellarmine speaketh, but also the Bardesanistes, of whome Saint Augustine writeth in his Booke of heresies, who ascribed all mans conuersation to destinie, and the Priscilianists, who because they make all their actions to bee ruled by the Planets, thinke that they sin against their will, and therfore doth not Iustin onely, but other of the godly fathers speak so plainly as they seeme to doe in defence of free will. Not because Cap. 55. Cap. 60.

they

they thinke, that man hath such ability being once renued by grace, that he can doe what hee will, as the papistes teach, but they only impugne these Stoicall opinions that affirme that man doth of necessitie euill or good. And that this is the meaning of Iustine the Martir by his owne wordes doth plainly appeare, because in both the places alleadged by maister Bellarmine, he setteth himselfe to reason against thē that would haue men thinke that all things were wrought by desteny. Against the which, he on the other side reasoneth, that if men had not will or choice in themselues to doe things, we should neither deserue punishment for euil doing, nor haue reward for well doing. Thus haue I truely & faithfully deliuered vnto thee (good reader,) the cause that maketh this and other of the ancient fathers especially before Pelagius to write so plainelie for free will. As also may wel be gathered out of Damascene. For when as yet there were none sprung vp, that did attribute too much to free wil as afterward the Pelagians did; but there were on the contrary, many that did wholy take al wil from man: no maruel if they did wholy oppose themselues against the daunger which they sawe present before their eies. And therefore they did teach as they did, to whom also we giue our right handes of fellowship and consent in doctrine, as Iames, Cephas, and Iohn, did vnto Barnabas and Paul. For we also doe teach, that man though by his fal he lost his freedome of wil, to him and his posterity: yet his wil he lost not, but still had it, and hath it. Whereby very readily and willingly he runneth vnto euil. But hauing his wil renued by Gods spirit, it is then good, so much as it is renued, it loueth good, and would faine do it, and in that sence wee also saie with saint Augustine, that it is free, that is, willing and readie: but yet not free, that is, not able to performe that good which we would, by reason of the infirmitie of our new man, the corruption of our nature, and the manifolde intisementes and tentations whereby we are withdrawen from holy obedience.

De fide Orthod. li. 2. cap. 7.

Gal. 2. 9.

What wee say of mās will.

Ad Bonif. contra. 2. epist. Pelag. lib. 1. cap. 8

And

And now if the first fathers, did not so plentifully set forth mans weakenes, as they did his wil to power to do things, it is no maruell because they neither knew Pelagians nor papistes, but them that erred in the contrary opinion.

And this being wel considered of, maie serue I trust to answere to whatsoeuer they can alleadge out of the fathers for free wil: & may teach vs, that they cal it free, not as it is able, but as it is willing, to do good & eschew euil. And therfore saint Augustine saith, Men are driuen, to the ende they should doe, not that they should doe nothing. And for this cause saint Bernard saith, That a man may not be called, or can indeed be good or euill, vnlesse he be willing. And saint Ambrose, or whatsoeuer wrote the bookes of the calling of the Gentiles, There is no kinde of vertue that may bee had, either without the gift of Gods grace, or the consent of our will. But of an infinite number of such like places, let these few be sufficient, to teach vs, that they ment not to extol the power of mans wil, but to lay the fault in man, if he refuse the graces offered, and to stirre vp men willingly and readily to receiue them, and stedfastly to keepe, and holily to vse them. And thus much generally, for the true vnderstanding of all the testimonies of the fathers that are alleadged by maister Bellarmine, not only in his first booke, de gratia & libero arbitrio: but also those other that he hath in his first booke, where he especially handleth the question of free wil, in things appertaining to godlines. Whereas before he indeuoured to proue it in moral vertues. But because that in the former, he did lay the foundation of that which in the first he teacheth, and al belonged to that end. Namely, to the question of free wil, which in this chapter I am to handle, therefore haue I thought good to answere in this one place whatsoeuer he saith tending to that end. As for his foure arguments out of the scriptures, which he bringeth in the first booke, the answere to them I trust may be gathered

De corrept. & gra. cap. 2. De gra. & libero arbitrio lib. 2. cap. 9.

Cap. 25, 26, 27, 28.

Cap. 12.

Cap. 20.

rew of that is already answered. Sauing only that the first and third require a more special answere. For his second argument in this first booke, is al one with the fourth in the fift booke. And his fourth and last in the first, is like the first in the fift booke. His first argument in the first booke is taken especially of the word *Cooperarii*, Worke men togither with God, for so the greeke word doth signifie, not
1. Cor. 3. Fellow-helpers, as the common latin translation hath, as though God could not without vs worke. Wel let vs see his argument. We are workemen togither with God. therefore we haue freewil, say they. But we may more iustlie conclude on the contrary, therefore we haue not freewil as the papists teach, it selfe able to doe good, or auoide euill. For that is it that is in question. We willingly confesse, that we being regenerate haue a willingnes to good, and a mislike of euil, but we say that we cannot performe this our good desire. And therefore seeing we cannot worke, but as workemen togither with God, it is most euident and plaine, that our will hath not that power that the church of Rome teacheth it to haue, to be freely moued to good. And therefore wel saith S. Augustine, That we will, God
De gra. & li. arb. 2. cap. 17. worketh without vs, but when we will, and so will that we also doe, he worketh togither with vs. But without him either working that we may will, or working with vs when we will, we haue no power to the good workes of godlines. And by this also appeareth the answere to the other argument which I saide was not before answered. We are saith M. Bellar. holpen by God in praier, or in any good worke, therefore we haue free wil. If we remember how they teach, that a man being once holpen and stirred vp by Gods grace, is afterwards freely able to doe good, hauing his wil thus reuiued, or rather vnfettered, a mā would not thinke M. Bellar. to be in earnest in such argumentes. Suppose you should vndertake to beare a burden far heauier then you could carry, and another much stronger than you, taketh it vp, and beareth it, you also laying your hands

to

to the same, to helpe as you can. Will you say you are able to beare it, because your hand also touched it? Euen such is our ability in keeping Gods commaundements. Or as children when they are first taught to goe. Their mother lifteth them vp that they maie put their legges forwarde, holdeth vp their coates that they be no hinderance to them, yea helpeth them to step forward. There is nothing in the childe, but only that it would faine goe, but it hath not strength to perform it. Is it now any reason to say, the child is able to goe, because the mother doth thus helpe it. No no, seeing Gods helpe is such that he worketh both to will and to doe in vs, let vs giue glory vnto him only, by whom we may doe al things, and without whom we can doe nothing. And we may iustly be ashamed of such foolish reasons: God helpeth vs, therefore we haue free will. We may perchance conclude thereupon that we doe somewhat, but how little it is that we doe, nay how we doe very nothing, without Gods good grace in the workes of Godlinesse, in all this Chapter is I hope sufficiently declared. Philip. 2. 13. Phil. 4. 13. Iohn. 15. 5.

But nowe for the conclusion of this Chapter, I would gladlie knowe of them that so stiflie maintaine free will, howe they can cleare themselues from the Pelagian heresie, so hated of all the Godly, so often condemned by Councels, and so mightilie confuted by Saint Augustin in many of his bookes? Andradius answereth this matter fully. They confesse, saith hee, our strength to bee so weake (he speaketh of them that made the censure of Colen) that vnlesse it be made strong by Gods grace, wee can neither doe nor will anie perfect good thing. But the Pelagians will grant thus much: And yet S. August. calleth them hereticks, & oftentimes enemies of the grace of Christ, yea new hereticks, enemies to the crosse of Christ, such as fought against, forsoake, yea persecuted the grace of Christ. And yet I say they grãted asmuch as the papists doe. First they cãfesse that by grace they were holpen that Orth. explic. lib. 4.

they

Aug. ad Bon. li. 1. cap. 3. they might become Gods children. Yea that they were alwaies holpen by Gods grace in euery good worke. And
Cap. 19. that grace helpeth euerie bodies good purpose. Now let
Lib. 4. cap. 6. the reader iudge wherin the popish Pelagians, differ from those old condemned Pelagians. They seeme to be birders of one nest. What doth S. Augustine (out of whom I haue alleadged this confession of the Pelagians) I say, what doth he think of their words? he liketh them wonderful wel. In so much, as doubtles, saith he, a man would thinke this
Ibidem. were spoken like a catholicke. How then fel it out that still he was accounted an hereticke, and his fauorites? S. Augustine although he could not mislike much of that he saide, yet he could not but condemne their intent and meaning. And therefore when he had said it was spoken like a catholicke, he addeth, If they would not thinke of merit in this their good purpose, to which merit reward should bee giuen as of duty, not of grace. Now I pray you to what end doth the church of Rome defende this doctrine of free wil? Is it not that the doctrine of merits may follow? Yes I warrant you. That is it they so earnestly contend for. For thereby they gaine both credit and royne. So that they seeme then to agree in their words, and in their intent. Seeing therefore this doctrine of free wil, doth so conspire with the Pelagian heresie, and so dissent from the word of God as hath beene shewed: let vs say with saint Augustine, Thinking we beleeue, thinking we speake, thinking we
Aug. de bon. seuerantiæ, cap. 13. doe whatsoeuer we doe: but concerning the true waie of godlines, and seruice of God: we are not sufficient of our selues to thinke any thing as of our selues, but our sufficiency is of God. And therefore we liue more safely, when we yeeld all to God, and commit not our selues in part to him, and in
Ibidem. ca. 6. part to our selues, as the same saint Augustine saith els where.

That

CHAP. 25

THE PROTESTANTS.

BEcause no righteousnes can stand before God, but that which is perfect: & the rule of perfection is to loue the Lord our God with all our *heart, soule, strength and thought, & our neighbour as our selfe.* We therfore must needs confesse, that the workes that are done by vs, whilest we carrie about this bodie, *which is a heauy burden to the soule*, are so defiled with cōcupiscence (which the Papists thēselues confesse to be euill and hated of God) that neither wee can so freely and zealously serue God as we would, neyther whollie respect Gods glorie therein as we should: But find our selues too colde and careless in good things: and that wee alwaies will haue some respect to our selues in doing the same. And therefore wee are compelled with

Luc. 10. 27.

Wisd. 9. 15.

THE PAPISTS.

BVT the Papists trusting too much in their own power to doe good, and not considering truely, what maner of worke that is, which may iustly be called a good worke, to what end, and with what affection it must be done: do teach, that a man may doe such workes, as that hee may merit thereby Iustification and eternall life euen as a due reward. *And that this is a point of Gods infinite mercy that he promiseth eternal life to them that worke well. Nay, that by Christes passion and the holy ghost, there is giuen to our workes a certaine infinitenes, to the end, that partly being holpen by such a gift, they might worthily deserue eternall life: wherein they haue in feme wordes many blasphemies. As that there may seeme to be some proportion, betweene the rewarde, and the worke, they haue deuised*

Concil. Trid. Sess. 6. ca. 32. Cens. Colonienſ. dial. 5.

Dialogo 1.

Cens. Colon. dial. 5.

THE PROTESTANTS

with the prophet *Dauid* to ſay, *If thou (O Lorde) ſtraitly markeſt iniquities, (O Lorde) who ſhall ſtand?* We knowe, that hee that *found wickednesſe in his Angels, and no ſtedfaſtnes in his ſaints, yea in whoſe ſight the heauens are not cleane*, no more the childe but of a day olde, he (I ſay) wil eaſily finde out, that *none can make cleane that that is conceiued of vncleane ſeed*, neither can hee be iuſt that is borne of a woman, according to the courſe of nature. But we confeſſe with the prophet *Eſay*, *we haue al bin as an vncleane thing, and all our righteouſneſſe is as filthie cloutes.* Yea, and if it might be, that we might liue here ſo, *that we knew nothing by our ſelues*, and yet *we are not thereby iuſtified*: how much leſſe then ſhall wee ſeeke to iuſtifie our ſelues by our workes, wherein, by reaſon of our corruption, we muſt needs finde and feele manifolde wants. Which imperfection, euen in our beſt workes is ſufficiently declared.

Pſal. 130. 2

Iob 14. 18. Iob 15. 15

Iob 14. 4.

Iob 15. 14.

Eſa. 64. 6.

2. Cor. 4. 4

THE PAPISTS

deuiſed how the worke it ſelf ſhall haue in it, a certaine infiniteneſſe that is, an exceeding excellencie. And yet S. Paul ſaith, that the afflictions of this preſent time, are not worthy of the glory which ſhall be ſhewed vnto vs. *And if all we can ſuffer here, haue no comparison with that glorie, what infinite goodneſſe can wee imagin our workes may haue? And whereas the Scriptures in this matter of iuſtification do take all the glorie from our Workes, and giue it vnto God: they ſo part ſtakes betweene God and their good workes, that their workes being holpē but in part (that is, but a little) by grace doe woorthily deſerue eternall life. So it ſeemeth that they will not be much beholding to God for their ſaluation, as the indifferent Reader may ſoone perceiue. Who if they continue in this their blaſphemie, and bragge thus of their merites, they ſhal without queſtion fall from grace. And if they will needs ſeek to eſtabliſh their owne righteouſneſſe, they can not be partakers*

Rom. 8. 18

Rom. 3. 26, 27, 28

Aug. in Pſal. 31. præfat.

Rom. 10. 3.

THE PROTESTANTS

clared, in that, neither the sacrifices of the Iewes, neither yet the praiers or spirituall sacrifices of the Christians, can of themselues bee acceptable vnto God, but only *through Iesus Christ our Lord*: whose mediation they should not need, if of themselues they were perfect. But hee must season them, he must sanctifie them, he must offer the, that they may be acceptable vnto God.

THE PAPISTS

partakers of Gods righteousnesse. And if they will not haue it by faith, without the workes of the lawe, they can neuer haue it. Yet to say our owne workes cannot saue vs, hath bin counted heresie. Rom.3.28. Act. & Monum. Fox lib. 8.1117.

Now that our aduersaries are in this point, so stiffe vpon so small a ground, it being so necessary a point of religion, that without true knowledge thereof, they cannot be saued, I cannot but maruell. For besides that which before I haue said of the imperfection of our workes, which is confessed by themselues) for Andradius confesseth that the Iesuits of Colen say, that it cannot be, that we can loue God perfectly and sufficiently in this life) besides that imperfection I say, which is in any thing that we can do, which cannot answere for that perfect righteousnes, which God iustly may require of vs: there are sundry other great reasons to induce vs, to detest that doctrine, as a thing most dãgerous for christians to giue eare vnto. Our sauiour Christ when he hath by the parable of the seruant, taught vs that it is our duetie to do that which he commaundeth vs, he addeth this, So likewise yee, when you haue done all those things that are commanded you: say we are vnprofitable seruauntes: wee haue done that was our dutie to doe. If then it be our dutie to keepe Gods commaundements, yea and that not once, but that so long as wee liue, wee must doe it, as Saint Ambrose saieth: and if as Theophilact saith, that wee are bounde to keepe all Gods

Orthod. explic. lib. 5.

Luc.17.9.

10.

In luc. li.8.

In luc.ca.17

commaundements: I would faine learne of some of our aduersaries, howe the doing of that thing which wee alwaies ought to doe, can satisfie Gods wrath, for neglect of such dueties as we haue not done, and such sinnes as wee haue committed contrary to Gods lawe: for if now I keepe the commaundement, it is my duety nowe and alwayes to doe it. Can this then bee any recompence to satisfy God for such times as I haue omitted my duetie? It cannot be, it hath no likelihoode of trueth. May, if he worke not (saieth Theophilact) hee is woorthy of many stripes, and if he worke, let him content himselfe, that he is not beaten. Therefore let him not seeke for reward or honor for it. Therfore seeing euery worke that wee do is a sacrifice that then must be offered, a duty that then must be performed, and that also very short I warrant you of that wee should performe, if it were well sifted, how can we say that such a worke can merite eternall life? Or, if that worke can but serue that duety that then is required, what recompence shall wee make for all other our sinnes. For it is a question amongst themselues whether Christ by his death did take away any sinnes, but only originall sinne. For Ambrose Catharinus an archbishop, and a great man at the Councell of Trent, doeth plainely write, that Christ died onely for originall sinne. As for actuall sinnes, they must be taken away by masses and such helps, saith he. Now if we had no other hope but such paltry popish deuises, to take away our sinnes wherein we continually offend, we were the most miserable of all creatures.

Luc. 17.

In his booke de Incruento sacrif.

But to returne to the wordes of our sauiour Christ. Out of them we may reason thus. If our most perfect obedience be but duety, it is not merit: but it is but duety: therefore no merit. This whole argument is necessarily to be gathered out of the words themselues, as you see the forenamed fathers doe testifie. Which place also is very strong against their most blasphemous doctrine of their

workes of supererrogation. For if all wee can doe, bee scarce our owne dutie, then can it not serue for others, to satisfie for their sinnes. And yet is this doctrine defended by them, as by Nichol Burne in his booke, yea, and by master Bellarmine, who is so little ashamed thereof, that as it were a doctrine that must needes be graunted vnto him, he endeuoureth thereby to prooue that we may keepe Gods lawe: A man (saieth he) may doe more than God commaundeth: therefore much more may hee fulfill the law.

Against workes of Supererrogation. Cap. 10.

De iustificat. lib. 4. cap. 13

Now if you will knowe the mystery of this great abhomination, it is this (as they tel vs.) Whereas some men, say they, haue beene so godly that they haue done mo good workes than they needed, these are as it were the treasure of the church, which the Pope may at his pleasure bestow. And so he doth: for the pardons and indulgences haue their vertue from these workes. So that if there bee no such workes: then the Pope like a false merchant hath deceiued the world for many yeeres, as still he doeth. For his pardons, *Agnus Dei*, his *grana benedicta*, and such baggage, haue no vertue, but from their workes of supererrogation. And here I can but wonder, at the whorish forehead of the church of Rome in this thing. Shee can in no wise abide the imputation of Christes righteousnesse for our iustification: shee may not heare of it. All Popish Writers write against it. And yet their doctrine of merites, especially of the workes of supererrogation, what is it but the imputation of other mens merites, as they think to satisfie for vs, and for our iustification. Shal Christes righteousnesse imputed to vs, be absurd to teach? and to teach the imputation of mans workes a sound doctrine? We may see by this, that in the church of Rome, that doctrine is best that is most gainefull. For the Pope can gaine but little worldly wealth, by preaching the imputation of Christes righteousnesse vnto vs: But by this doctrine of the workes of supererrogation hee gaineth

much. For because it is the treasure of the church, whosoeuer will haue thereof must pay well for it to the church, that is to the pope. But howe doth master Bellarmine proue, that we can doe more than wee neede. Because that Christ bid one that said he had kept all the commandements, Sell all he had, and giue it to the poore. I will not presse master Bellarmine here with the iudgement of the fathers, who finde this to be a commaundement and therfore not more than neede. And saint Augustine seeth it to be a law against couetousnes. But who so euer will consider of the place, maie easilie see, that our sauiour Christ did purpose by this commaundement, to let him see his owne ignorance of his estate, and that he knew not his owne wants. Not meaning that it should be a commandement, of that he was not by Gods lawe bound to performe, but rather a rule whereby he might trie how far he was from keeping the second table of the commaundements, and therfore that he might euen condemne himselfe to be much shorter, of keeping the first table. As for his proofe out of Chrysostome, Manie doe more than they are commanded, it is true that Chrysostome, saieth so, but it is also true ỳ he speaketh of such things, as are not simply of themselues good workes, but indifferent of themselues. But the vse or abuse of them, doth make them good workes, or euill. His examples that hee bringeth are of virginitie, that it is not commaunded (but this master Bellarmine omitteth of purpose, because it maketh against their doctrine of vowes:) neither is it commaunded (saieth hee) that men should not possesse any thing. Yea, I knowe that the Scribes and Pharisees did many things that God neuer commaunded, as also the Iewes in the time of Esay, to whom it was sayde, Who required these things at your handes? And this is also an answere to that which out of Augustine he alledgeth. What biddest thou? That wee should not bee adultresses? Commaundest thou that? In louing thee,

Mat. 19. 21

Confess. li. 13. cap. 19.

Hom. 8. de pœnitentia.

Esa. 1. 12.

De verbis Apostol. ser. 13.

we doe more than thou commaundest. For hee also speaketh of keeping virginitie. But master Bellarmines antecedent is thus to bee vnderstoode, that wee doe no good workes than God commaundeth, or else his argument is to bee denied. For we see by experience that the Papists doe an infinite number of things that God neuer commaunded. For which as they haue no warrant of God, so shall they haue no praise of him. And they may doe a thousand such workes, and bee neuer a whit nearer keeping Gods lawe, but much further off rather. For the more that men satisfie themselues with their owne workes, the lesse care they haue to keepe Gods commaundements, as our sauiour Christ teacheth vs. And maister Bellarmines antecedent beeing thus vnderstoode (as I haue saide,) that wee may doe more good workes than God hath commaunded, is false. For in that it is not a good worke, if it bee besides Gods worde. And this is all that hee sayeth in that place for the woorkes of Supererrogation. Mat. 15. & 23

Thus we see this rich doctrine hath a poore proofe. But if there were nothing to conuince the wickednesse of that doctrine, but this one thing, that they will seeme to mende that rule of perfection that God hath made, and take vpon them to prescribe more perfect rules, than God hath set downe, it argueth in them too prophane saweinesse. But thus much by the way of this kind of worke. For my purpose is not to make of it any seueral discourse, because that if it bee prooued, that wee cannot iustifie our selues by our workes, it will followe that wee can much lesse helpe others. Nowe maister Bellarmine finding this weapon too sharpe, this place to strong agaynst their merits would faine wrest it out of our hands. And first he telleth vs that saint Ambrose willeth vs to knowe what wee are of our selues. Wee must knowe the grace, but not bee ignorant of our nature, saieth saint Ambrose. De iustif. lib. 5. ca. 5.

It is true, he writeth so, and that vpon iust occasion. For the very beginning of that sentence is, Peferre not thy self because thou art called a sonne: and then followeth: thou must confesse the grace, and not forget thy nature. As if he should say, thinke no wrong that thou art called an vnprofitable seruant, seeing thou art called a sonne. Thou art a sonne by grace, because God hath chosen thee, but if a man looke on thy worke, it is not worth mayling. But what is this to answere the argument? Nothing at all. Maister Bellarmine perchance thinketh, that if he bring in the fathers as witnesses, they will speake as hee would haue them. Yet not Ambrose onely, but also Augustine and Chrysostome, in the places by him cited, and Theophilact vpon these words, doe teach, that Christ would not haue vs proude of our good workes, that it is our dutie alwayes to worke, and as Ambrose saieth, We owe him our seruice, therefore let vs not boast of our worke. But as Theophilact sayth, If anie thing bee giuen vs, let vs be glad of it, hee that giueth it oweth vs nothing. But the seruant oweth to his master the keeping of all that he commandeth. So all this still strengtheneth my argument, that all that we can do, it is but our duetie, and therefore no merite. And although in respect of our election we may iustly reioyce that wee are Gods deare children: yet when we looke vpon our selues, wee must needes confesse vs to bee vnprofitable and vnperfect. Secondly, the repugnancie betweene grace and merite, set downe by saint Paul, is a strong argument against iustification by workes. If it be of grace, it is no more of workes, or else were grace no more grace, or if it bee of workes, it is no more grace, or else were worke no more worke. Wherein we see how plainly the Apostle opposeth the one against the other, that we cannot be said to bee iustified by grace, if we may attribute anie part of our iustification to workes. Neither will their common answer serue, that saint Paul speaketh of the first mercie that God sheweth

Li. 8. in Luc. de verbis Apost. ser. de humilitate 18, in Oziam

Merit and grace ouerthrowe one another. Rom. 11. 6

sheweth vs, as that we are called to be Christian men or women, by grace without our workes, but that hereby hee excludeth not the workes that afterwardes we do, from merite. For seeing our aduersaries must needs confesse, that after our first calling, yea, and continually so long as we liue, we must acknowledge, that but by grace wee cannot bee saued: this grace which themselues dare not but confesse, taketh away merit: so that if grace bee free and without workes in our first iustification, it can neuer stand with workes in the rest of our life: For still must this bee true, if it bee of grace it is not then of workes, if of workes then not of grace.

The mistrust of their workes.

Thirdly, the great mistrust which I see themselues doe put in this their doctrine of iustification by workes, maketh me (who see no cause to like of it) the more to shunne it. For maister Bellarmine, no meane man for learning among them, when hee hath taken much paines to deceyue other with this doctrine, yet himselfe dareth not trust it, and therefore setteth downe a verie good rule, which if Caluine or Luther had written it, it must needes haue beene called hereticall. Because (saith he) of the vncertaintie of our owne righteousnesse, and the daunger of vaine glorie, the safest way is to put our whole confidence in Gods mercie and goodnesse. Vnto which his good and true doctrine, wee say Amen, and yet I hope we shall not be called heretikes. The safest way to saluation is that we seek: let others passe what perillous places it shall please them. These and such other considerations doe make me muse, that euer men will forsake God, the fountaine of liuing waters, to digge them pits, euen broken pits that can holde no waters, that they will leaue the plaine and safe way, and choose the way that hath greatest daunger, wherein they deale not onely foolishly for themselues, but wickedly also with them that they leade into these blinde wayes. And I would haue all men to marke this well, that that doctrine, which vpon paine

Bellar. & Antheran. iustif. lib. cap. 7.

Ierem. 2. 13.

of

of ſaluation and damnation they teach men muſt beleeue, is daungerous by their owne confeſſion, and the contrarie moſt ſafe. A great argument to teach vs, that they care not ſo much for the ſaluation of mens ſoules, as to get of men profit and credite. And therefore they are the leſſe to be truſted or eſteemed in other poynts in controuerſie, who deale ſo vnchriſtianly in the moſt neceſſarie article of our religion. For you muſt vnderſtande there are two wayes to eternal life, or rather (to ſpeake with the Apoſtle) two kindes of righteouſneſſe. The one ſo hard to hit, that no man or woman, excepting onely Chriſt Ieſus, God and man, could go it, ſo full of ſnares and traps, that none but hee could continue in it. This is that righteouſneſſe
Rom. 10.5. of the Lawe, which Moſes deſcribeth thus. The man that doeth theſe things ſhall liue thereby. And this righteouſneſſe did our Sauiour Chriſt ſpeake of, to the expounder of the lawe that came to him to aſke, What
Luke. 10.25 ſhall I doe to inherite eternall life? He ſent him to the lawe. For if wee will be ſaued by workes, we muſt keepe the lawe. But then muſt we knowe, That whoſoeuer
Iam. 2.10. keepeth the whole lawe, and yet fayleth in one poynt, he is guiltie of all. Nowe this vngone, and vnbeaten way, ſo hard for vs to hit, ſo vnpoſſible to keepe, the church of Rome teacheth vs, that wee muſt keepe, and yet neuer any of her deareſt darlings could get to heauen that way. But the righteouſneſſe that is by fayth, knoweth that Chriſt diſcended into the deepe, and died for our ſinnes, and aſcended into heauen to iuſtifie vs, and bring vs thither. For if thou confeſſe with thy mouth
Rom. 10.9. the Lorde Ieſus, and beleeue in thy heart that God rayſed him vp from the dead, thou ſhalt bee ſaued. But this righteouſneſſe pleaſeth not our aduerſaries, becauſe all the glorie of working is giuen from themſelues. This way they thinke too baſe, becauſe it is not garniſhed with their workes, and ſtrewed with their merits. And yet
Eſaie. 30.21. This is the way, walke ye in it. As for that middle way

which

which themſelues haue deuiſed, which ioyneth Chriſtes righteouſneſſe and theirs together, as though hee onelie could not ſaue them: it is no good way, for it maketh to wander from the path of Gods worde, and is daungerous by their owne confeſſion. Take heede therefore of it, for it is the way that leadeth to death and damnation. Of this way I may ſay as ſaint Auguſtine doth of them that ſeeke for worldly happineſſe by good workes. Although (ſaith he) thou ſtir thine armes in good works, and thou ſeeme moſt skilfully to rule thy boat, yet thou runneſt vpon the rockes. But nowe let vs ſee what argumentes maiſter Bellarmine vſeth to proove this their doctrine of iuſtification by workes. Great is your reward (or wages, or hire) in heauen. Eternall life (ſaith he) is the wages, therefore doubtleſſe workes are the merits. Maiſter Bellarmine reaſoneth thus. Eternall life is your wages, therefore your workes haue deſerued it. The weakneſſe of this argument appeareth at the firſt: but yet for ỳ more cleare vnderſtanding of this & ſuch other places, a worde or two may be added. That God giueth vs eternall life for wages wee will not denie, if it be vnderſtood aright. Admit therefore that a man hireth two workmen to worke with him: the one of them a ſufficient workeman, who doeth his worke: The other can worke little or nothing, yet he that hireth him bideth him worke alſo, and doe his beſt, and he ſhall haue his wages alſo. Nowe the one of theſe who is the workeman, his hire or wages is due to him for his worke, hee hath deſerued it: the others wages is due alſo, and hee may challenge it: not becauſe he hath earned it by his worke, but hee that hired him, hath made himſelfe his debter by his promiſe. We ſee then, not euerie wages is deſerued. Wee are that euill workeman, wee can doe nothing worthie of our wages, yet God by promiſe is indebted vnto vs. Therefore although our rewarde or wages be great, yet is it not deſerued of our part. Our wages is called grace (ſaith ſaint Auguſt.) If it be grace, it is

Aug. in pſal. 31 prælat. M. Bellar. Argument. for merito. Mach. 5. 12. De iuſtif. 5. cap. 3.

Præfat. in Pſal. 31.

freely

freely giuen. What is the meaning of this, it is freely giuen? It costes vs nothing. Thou hast done no good, and forgiuenesse of sins is giuen to thee. It is then no good argument to say: eternal life is our wages, therefore we haue deserued it. His second argument. God shall reward euery man according to his worke: Therefore the workes are meritorious. The scriptures we confesse vse often so to speake, but not to establish merit, but to shake off security. And to this end they tell vs, that if the worke be good, it shall haue the reward of a good worke, if it be euill, it shall be punished. And so doth Saint Paul, vsing the selfe same words, which are also alleadged by maister Bellarmine expound himselfe. To them which by continuance in well doing, seeke glory, and honour, and immortality: eternal life: But vnto them that are contentious and disobey the truth and obey vnrighteousnes: indignation and wrath. Thus then we see that this according to the worke, doth not signifie according to the merit of the worke, but according to the quality of the worke. And these kinde of speeches are very like to that, that God said to Cain, and perchance are grounded vpon it. If thou doe well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou dost not well, sinne lieth at the dore. And when he telleth vs, that in this iudgement, God shal be the rewarder, he armeth vs against hipocrisie, seeing that he who cannot be corrupted with bribes, nor deceiued with ignorance of the cause, shal examine the worke. And yet for the comfort of the Godly we must also know, that hee accepteth of their worke, not according to the imperfection of the worke it selfe, but according to the spirit of regeneration which hee hath wrought in them that worke it. And so because the fruit commeth from a good tree, he accounteth the better of it. Therefore if he crowne in vs our merites, he crowneth nothing but his owne giftes, as saith saint Augustine. Thus then we see, there is not any necessity in this argument: God rewardeth the good worke with glory and immorta-

Rom. 2. 6. verse 7. 8.

Gen. 4. 7.

Li. 50. Homiliarum, Homil. 14.

mortality, therefore the worke hath merited that reward. And this is the answere also to his thirde argument out of these wordes of saint Matthew, Come yee blessed of my father, inherit the kingdome prepared for you, &c. For I was an hungred and yee gaue me meat, &c. We confesse that God rewardeth good workes, and that is all that canne be proued out of these wordes. But this reward is not giuen in respect of the worke, but chiefly in regarde of Gods promise. And the rather also it is accepted, because of that spirit of regeneration from whence the worke commeth. But in the place alleadged by him out of the reuelation he dealeth not sincerely. For thus doth hee cite it: These are they that came out of great tribulation, therfore they are in the presence of the throne of God. But saint Iohn hath thus set it downe, These are they that came out of great tribulation, and haue washed their long robes, and haue made their long robes white in the bloud of the Lamb. Therefore are they in the presence of the throne of God. Not because they came out of tribulation, but because they did wash their robes in the bloud of the Lamb, That is in the grace of God through Iesus Christ our Lord, as saith saint Augustine. Deceitfullie therefore did maister Bellarmine leaue out the true cause of their being in the presence of God, that he might for fortifying of his errour, set downe that which was no cause of their being with God, for the true cause. Seeking rather by Sophistry to beguile, than with sound learning to teach. His fourth sort of places are such as speak of the iustice of Gods iudgement, and out of them he maketh this argument. God in iustice rewardeth good works, therefore good workes are meritorious. Maister Bellarmine doth, as many euill Captaines doe that deceiue the Prince, who when they haue not men enough of their owne, against the muster will borrow some souldiars of some other, to make out their number: but when they encounter the enemie, their borrowed souldiars are not there to fight for them, or

Matth. 25. 34

Apoc. 7. 14. 15

In spec. Hom. 8.

to

to doe any ſeruice, they were but borrowed to make a ſhew in the muſter. Euen ſo falleth it out with maiſter Bellarmine. He maketh a ſhew of many prooſes. But of al theſe which are brought in heere, there is not one that proueth directly, that God in iuſtice rewardeth good workes. He proueth by them eſpecially, that Gods iudgement is iuſt, which we deny not but ſay with Ieremie. O Lord are not
Ier.5.3. thine eies vpon the truth. And therefore theſe teſtimonies
2.Theſſ.1.4. 5.6. are to that effect that were the teſtimonies alleaged in his ſecond argument, and are there anſwered. The effect of
2.Tim.4.7.8. that he ſaith in the two firſt places is this. It is a token of Gods righteous iudgement, that he dealeth well with the Godlie. To this end alſo is that out of ſaint Paul to Timothy. I haue fought a good fight, and haue finiſhed my courſe: I haue kept the faith. Henceforth is laide vp for me the crowne of righteouſnes, which the Lord that righteous iudge ſhall giue me at that day. We neuer denied either God to be a righteous iudge, or his iudgements to be iuſt. What then will our aduerſaries inferre? Muſt he therfore iudge according to the worthines of our worke?
Iob.9.3. Pſal.130.3. God forbid. For if God woulde diſpute with man, hee were not able to anſwere one thing for a thouſand. And if the Lord ſhould ſtraightly marke our iniquities, who ſhould be able to abide it? And therefore now there is no way for vs, but to make our humble ſuit vnto God as doth
Pſal.143.2. Dauid: Enter not into iudgement with thy ſeruant, for in thy ſight ſhall no fleſh liuing be iuſtified. And yet he is iuſt, yea and ſo iuſt, that he will not ſuffer ſinne vnpuniſhed. But rather then he ſhould not be ſatisfied for the ſame to the vttermoſt, he gaue his ſonne to ſatisfie for the ſame, euen to make recompence for vs. So that our ſinne (the puniſhment whereof our ſelues could not beare) is puniſhed to the vttermoſt in Jeſus Chriſt. And by this ſatisfaction which Chriſt hath made for vs, we may ſtand without feare before Gods iudgement ſeat, and plead not guilty: Becauſe that he in whom God is well pleaſed, hath

paide

paid our debt. And seeing that Christ hath once made satisfaction for our sins, it were against Gods iustice to punish vs for the same. And thus we see how Gods iustice in iudgment, is an vnspeakeable comforte to our consciences: assuring vs, that God looketh not vpon vs in his iudgment as we are in our selues, but as wee are belonging to his sonne Christ. Neither yet doth he weigh the merite of our workes, but how they are made acceptable through Christ: who hath merited by his death & passiō eternal life, for al them that beleeue in him. He looketh not I saie what we haue done, but what Christ hath done. And it is iust he should so doe: for he was content to take him to be our surety. And this is also for the vnderstanding of the fourth place alleadged by maister Bellarmine. For God is not vnrighteous that he should forget your worke. In which place Gods righteousnes is taken for his truth and faithfulnes in keeping promise, that he is as good as his word, and will reward euery good worke that is done for his sake, but not for the merit of the worke, but for his owne mercy. That which is alleadged out of Saint Iames, answereth it selfe, if M. Bellarmine had not stopped S. Iames his breath too soone. Blessed is the man that indureth tentation: for when he is tried he shall receiue the crowne of life, saith S. Iames. But it followeth, which the Lord hath promised to them that loue him. And of this maister Bellarmine saith nothing. And yet saint Iames saith plainly that that which they receiue, it is according to promise. And out of the reuelation. Be thou faithful vnto the death and I will giue thee a crowne of life. How can he proue merites out of it? Is this a good argument, I will giue thee, therefore thou hast deserued it? Two or three places more he there alleadgeth, but out of that I haue said, it is easie to answere them. His first sort of places are such as promise to good workes eternall life. And out of them he reasoneth thus. Promise of reward for a worke, doeth make that he that doth the worke, maie bee saide to merite

Heb. 6. 10.

Iames. 1. 12.

Apoca. 2.

his

his reward. That the reward is due but yet not deserued, I shewed before in the answere to his first argument, and I need not heere to repeat it. His first argument, is taken from those places that speake of our worthines, and are of
2. Thess. 1. 5. Luc. 20. 35. two sortes. For two of them, namely that That yee maie be counted worthy of the kingdome of God: and that also, They shalbe counted worthy to inioy that world, and the resurrection of the dead, doe answere themselues. For that may be accounted worthy, which of it selfe is not so in truth. As in our workes is seene, which are accounted of, not as they proceed from vs: but as they are presented before God in the name of Christ, and their imperfection couered, with his perfect obedience. The other two places seeme more pertinent to his purpose, but yet being rightlie vnderstood, proouc nothing for him. The first is in the booke of wisedome, which booke although it is not Canonicall, yet because the place alleadged seemeth like vnto the words that he alleadgeth out of the reuelation, they
Wisdom. 3. 5 Apocal. 3. 4. may both receiue one answere. God proueth them, and findeth them worthy for himselfe. The other place is, They shall walke with me in white, for they are worthy. First that this worthines doth many times signifie an aptnes or fitnes, it cannot be denied. Who (saith Salo-
2. Cron. 1. 10 mon) can iudge, this thy great people worthily? Where by worthely he meaneth not as they deserue (for they were a stubborne and bad people many times) but as is fit or meete to gouerne them. And so the Apostle willeth vs to walke worthy of God, worthy of our calling, worthy of the gospell, that is, as becommeth Gods children, them that are called, and fit for the professours of the gospell. And this fitnes is said to be in vs in respect of the new man that is begun within vs, not in respect of perfection, that we doe or can attaine vnto. And yet if we should indeed be worthy, we must be perfect, which heere we cannot be. And in this sence you see his argument hath no necessity. Men are worthy of loue, that is fit to loued, therefore they haue de-

serued

serued it: for this fitnesse is not of themselues. Secondly, although we be called worthy, in respect of our election in Christ, or in respect of the fruits of the spirite, which God commendeth in vs, although they haue their wants, that we might not be discouraged, but go on forwards in the wayes of godlinesse, yet this argument will not hold. We are worthy of loue: therefore our workes haue deserued this loue, or made vs worthy. For our worthinesse hangeth nothing vpon our works, but that God wil vouch vs to be so esteemed. But in respect of our works, we must confesse with the prophet Dauid: There is none that doth good, no not one. Psal. 53. 1. And therefore we must pleade, euen the best of vs, mercy and forgiuenesse, not merite or worthinesse. My merit (saith Saint Bernard) is the Lordes mercy: neither am I without merite, so long as hee is not without mercie. Super Cantic. ser. 61. His seuenth argument is grounded vpon those places of scripture, that say that God accepteth no persons. But must he needes therefore respect the worthinesse of the worke? If there be with him no difference betweene Iew and Gentile, bond or free, male or female, must merites needes be established? I haue often said, that God respecteth vs and our workes, but not for our goodnesse, but for his mercy sake. For this must needs be true that S. Paul teacheth vs according to the consent of the scripturs, that a man is iustified by faith without the workes of the lawe. Therefore (as saith S. August.) let mans merits be silent, which were lost through Adam, and let the grace of God through Iesus Christ raigne, as indeede it doth raigne. Rom. 3. 28. De prædest. Sanct. ca. 15 Now for the Fathers, if I should answer to euery testimony alleadged out of them, it would be too long: especially considering how largely I haue already handled this question. Onely thus much woulde I admonish the christian Reader, that when he readeth them, he should remember, they be but men. And if Theodoret said truly of the doctrines of the church, the decrees of the church are to be prooued, and not to be pronounced, in Dial. 3. Impatib.

maner of a iudgement: then how much more should we reiect whatsoeuer any men speake without a good warrant. Then also as they were men, so were many of them great Philosophers, & might somwhat perchance smel of that infection, & speake more of mans worthines, than had bin expedient for christian religion. In so much as not without great cause did Tertull. cal philosophers, The patriarchs of heretikes. And G. Nazian. cõpareth the subtilties of philosophy, which he saith, came vnhappily into the church, vnto the whips wherewith the Aegyptians did scourge the Israelits. In which kind of reasoning the tongue fighteth, the words are speares, the speech is the sword, & there is no end of contention all the day long, as the same father saith in an other place. And no maruel, for the Philosopher is *gloriæ animal*, euen the creature of glory, as Tertull. writeth. No doubt therfore but they might be somwhat caried away with her intising words, especially to thinke wel of that thẽselues do. Thirdly, as I haue said in the former chapter, the absurdities of thẽ that did teach, that God moued man, & wrought in or by him, as a workeman might do in or by a stocke or stone, they not hauing so much as will thereto, made the fathers to speake more, not only of mans freewil, as before I taught, but also of the reward of them that worke according to the same. And that this did the rather moue the fathers to speake somwhat too largely vpon this matter, vnlesse they be warely red, it may be gathered euen by that place that M. Bella. out of Origen alleadgeth, first (saith he) let heretikes be excluded, that say that the nature of soules is good or bad, & let thẽ heare that God wil reward them, not according to their nature, but according to their merits. Now cõcerning the vnderstãding of these words, I haue spokẽ in the answere vnto his secõd argument. But heere it appeareth that such heretikes did then trouble the church. Last of al, not al the vehemẽt speeches of the fathers, are to be taken or vnderstoode as they sound: but they must be warely red, and wisely examined by

Aduersus Hermog. Orat. 21.

Ser. de Arian.

De anima.

Lib. 2. in Rom. in ca. 2.

Rom. 2.

the

the touchstone of Gods word. And then it will appeare, that the Fathers, either may well bee taken, or iustly refused.

And thus hauing (I trust) in the iudgement of the indifferent Reader, sufficiently confirmed the trueth, answered the Scriptures alleadged to the contrary, and shewed some causes, why the fathers should in this point be read with good aduise and iudgement: it now onely remaineth that I lay open the absurditie of that shift, wherein they trust much, and which indeede is the chiefe strength of their cause. For being pressed with the testimonies out of scriptures, especially out of saint Paul, which plainely testifie that we are iustified by faith, without the workes of the law: first, they deuised this answere, that S. Paul speaketh of the ceremoniall lawes, that we are iustified without them, but not without doing the works of the law morall, or of the commaundements. But this being so vntrue an answere, that master Bellarmine himselfe is ashamed of it, and reasoneth against it: Master Bellarmine bringeth another answere, namely, that the Apostle speaketh of the workes before faith. So that he would haue the wordes of the Apostle thus to sound: Wee are iustified by faith without the works of the law that were done before we beleeued. And for the credit of this interpretation he would faine father it vpon S. Augustine and S. Ierome, but most vntruely, as he that examineth those places shall easily see, that S. Augustine and S. Ierome in those places doe not so expound those wordes of saint Paul, neither giue vs anie rule so to expound them. Neither yet doe Chrysostome, Ambrose, Theophilact, or Primasius vpon those words either in the third to the Romans, or second to the Galathians so expound it: Or yet S. Ierome vpon the Galathians. And in the Epistle that he writeth against the Pelagians to Ctesiphon, he denieth that those words may be vnderstood of the law ceremoniall: but concerning this exposition which master Bellarmine bringeth there is no word.

Rom. 3. 28

De iustificat. lib. 1. cap. 19.

De gr. & lib. arb. ca. 7. de prædest. sanctor. cap. 7. In præfat. pſ. 31

Ier. ad Ctesiphontem contra Pelagianos.

Rom. 4. 4.

As for the reason that Bellarmine hath out of S. Paul to proove this his exposition: let vs consider of it. Vnto him that worketh (saith S. Paul) the wages is not counted by fauour, but by debt. Therefore (saith M. Bellarmine) he speaketh onely of those workes that are done by the power of free will without grace. How little S. Paule dreamed of free will, hath in the former chapter beene declared. And that hee doeth not in these wordes expound, what he meant before by the workes of the lawe, the text it selfe proueth. For, hauing said, that Abraham beleeued God, and that was counted to him for righteousnes: thereupon the Apostle inferreth: that if he had beene iustified by workes, his iustification had bin of debt, not of grace. So that he doth not heere expound his former wordes, but beginneth in this fourth chapter an other argument, by the example of Abraham, being already iustified and a holie man, to proue iustification by faith without workes, euen by forgiuenesse of sinnes or couering them. And as I haue shewed master Bellarmines interpretation to stand vppon no good ground, but that the place aledged maketh against himselfe: so that which we gather out of S. Paules words to be the most true meaning, namely, that workes neither before nor after our first iustification (as they call it) can merit, the circumstances of the place do proue, & the whole course of his doctrine. He instructeth the Rom. & Galath. in this doctrine, who were already become christians, & already were iustified. He doth not only shew that the works of the law do not iustifie, but telleth vs, that ꝑ nature of the law is to make vs to know sin, & to cause wrath, euen after we be iustified. And S. Paul himselfe teacheth so much, in that he counted al that was in him to be but losse, yea dung. That he might win Christ, & be found in him, not hauing his own righteousnesse, which is of the lawe, but that which is through the faith of Christ, euen the righteousnesse which is of God through Christ. Marke heere how the Apostle saint Paul in these wordes, which

Rom. 7. 7.
Rom. 4. 15.
Philip. 3. 8, 9

were

were written almost thirty yeeres after his conuersion, still relieth vpon the righteousnesse that is by faith: and he calleth it Gods righteousnesse, and refuseth that which commeth by workes, and that he calleth mans righteousnesse. Now of this which is said, I trust I may thus reason. Saint Paul excludeth from iustification not only the workes that are done before we beleeue, but also the workes which we afterwards doe: therefore master Bellarmines interpretation is not true. If then workes cannot iustifie (as hitherto I haue taught) wee may say with saint Augustine, Wo bee euen to the commendable life of man, if thou Lord setting mercie aside examine it. For, as he saieth in an other place, Whatsoeuer God hath promised, hee hath promised to them that are vnworthie, that it should not be promised as wages for good works: but grace according to the name of it should be freely giuen. O therefore that all men (that with Saint Augustine I may wish that godly wish) would know themselues, and they that reioyce, would reioyce in the Lord, For this onely perfection is left to men, that they knowe themselues to be vnperfect: as truly and godlily saint Hierome writeth.

Confess. lib. 9. ca. 13.

Enarrat. psal. 109.

Confess. lib. 9. cap. 13.

Ad Ctesiphontem contra Pelagianos.

Of iustification by Faith: and what Faith is.

Chap. 26

THE PROTESTANTS

AND this Iustification, which by our workes we can not deserue, yet by faith we do obtaine, Not because our faith can of it selfe

THE PAPISTS

BVT our aduersaries, because they like not that Christ shoulde bee the onely salue for our sores, neyther will they haue faith to bee

THE PROTESTANTS

selfe worke any such effect. But it beeing a liuely and certain perswasion of our heart and conscience, that God for Christ Iesus his sake, forgiueth vs al our sinnes, and in him accounteth vs holie and righteous, doeth thus iustifie vs, not as that that worketh our iustification, but as that which apprehendeth and taketh holde of that righteousnes, that Christ hath wrought for vs. And so by faith he being made ours, *is vnto vs wisdome, and righteousnesse, and sanctification, and redemption. And being thus iustified by faith, wee haue peace with God, through our Lord Iesus Christ.*

What faith is.

1. Cor. 1. 30.

Rom. 5. 1

THE PAPISTS

the hande that applieth this soueraigne medicine to our maladies. But they are content to confesse that it doeth iustifie, yea, and that faith doth somewhat merit our iustification: because it doeth prepare and dispose the hart to iustification: or as Andradradius *saith, because it goeth before to open, as it were the doore to hope and charitie, and is the beginning and foundation of iustification: but that it iustifieth as the instrumentall cause, that maketh vs to rest and settle our selues for our iustification onely vpon Christ, without any regarde to the merit and woorke of Fayth, they will not graunt.*

Bellar. de iustif. li. 1. ca. 15. Con. Trid. Sess. 6. cap. 6. Orth. explica. li. 6.

A great cause of the difference betwene vs and the papists in this question, is that we agree not in the signification of the woorde, what it is to be iustified. This therefore is the question, whether wee that are not only by nature sinners, but also euen after our regeneration, haue that Lawe in our members rebelling, against the lawe of the minde, which saint Paul calleth sinne, and the papists themselues confesse to be euil, damned and hated of God: whether I say we being such sinners shal appeare righteous before God, in hauing our sinnes pardoned, couered and not imputed vnto vs, and Christs righteousnesse

Rom. 7. 17 Bellar. de Amiss. grat. li. 5. ca. 13.

ousnesse accounted ours: or in that goodnes or holines, or those good workes, which Gods grace worketh in vs. We say that Christ by faith is made ours: Christ I say with all his holinesse and righteousnesses, By whom we haue redemption through his bloud, the forgiuenes of sinnes, according to his rich grace. And in this assurance we stand euen before Gods iudgment seat without feare, and say with the apostle Who shall laie anie thing to the charge of gods chosen? It is God that iustifieth who shal condemne vs. It is Christ that is dead, yea or rather is risen againe. Who is also at the right hand of God, and also maketh request for vs. And in this faith and assured perswasion, we haue peace of conscience here, and are in Christ and for his sake accounted righteous elsewhere, euen before him that shall iudge the quicke and the dead. They teach vs that after baptisme sinne is so killed within vs, that we are able to doe such workes as doe merit iustification and eternall life. And by this righteousnesse that is in vs, we are made so iust and righteous, that we are so iustified before God. To confirme that which we teach, we haue the promise made to. Abraham That in his seede all the nations of the earth should be blessed. In his seede I say, not in our selues we must all be blessed. And that Christ is this seede, saint Paul to the Galathians doth affirme. Secondly the iustification of the people of the Iewes, which they by their sacrifices obtained, is a right pattern of our iustification. For though the bloud of of the beasts could not make them holy, yet the sacrifice being offered for them according to the law, did worke so much, that they who before were accounted vncleane, and might not appeare before the Lord, nowe were accounted cleane, and might serue before him. Euen so we, though wee bee not in our selues, yet by this our sacrifice that hath offered him selfe a sweete smell vnto God the father, wee are accounted cleane and without sinne, and haue by him accesse vnto that grace wherein

Ephe. 1.7

Rom. 8.33. 34

Popish iustification.

That iustification is not by workes, but by imputation.

Gen. 22.18.

Gal. 3.16.

Hep. 9.9.

Rom. 5.2.

we stand. Thirdly, this iustification is commended vnto vs
Psal.32.1.2 by Dauid, Blessed is he whose wickednesse is forgiuen, and whose sinne is couered. Blessed is the man to whom
Psal.103.3 the Lord imputeth not iniquitie. And for this cause he stirreth vp his soule to praise the Lord: because saith he, He
Iere.31.34 forgiueth al thine iniquities. It is promised by Ieremie, I will forgiue their iniquities, and remember their sinnes
Hose.14.2 no more. And the Prophet Hose teacheth the people to pray for it, saying thus. Take vnto you words, and turne to the Lord, and say vnto him, Take away all iniquitie, and receiue vs graciously. Where this is also by the way to be marked, that ỹ prophet here biddeth vs come to God, with such words, as if he had said, Your works are euill, and cannot helpe, they cannot merit, Yet come with good words, be suiters for grace. Fourthly, our sauiour Christ doth commend vnto vs this iustification which we haue by
Iohn 3.16 him, & apprehend by faith. Whosoeuer beleeueth in him shall not perish, but haue euerlasting life. Of whom the apostles also haue learned that we are iustified by faith, that
Rom.3.28 righteousnes is imputed vnto vs, & that we are accounted
Rom.4.3.11 righteous. Lastly, we see how ỹ apostle doth exclude works frō iustifying, than which there can be no stronger argumēt against this inherent iustification which the papists contend for, or for the imputation of righteousnes by faith in Christ Iesus, which we according vnto the scriptures doe preach. And therefore he doth not onely exclude works in generall
Rom.3.28 from iustification, Iustified by faith without the workes
Gal.2.11. of the law: But also those works that Abraham did after
Rom.4. his first calling, when now he was regenerate, euen then, I say, attributing iustification to faith and not to his workes.
Phil.3.9. And likewise for his owne works long after he was regenerate, he reiecteth them that he might attaine vnto righteousnesse by faith. So little did he trust vnto that inherent righteousnesse, that he counted it but dung: and so wholie did he depend on that righteousnes that we haue by faith in Christ Iesus. But of this I haue spoken in the end of the

former

former chapter. And I trust this may serue the turne, to shew how farre we are from that inherent righteousnes and keeping of the law, which our popish Pharisees dreame of: especially if we consider what great perfection the law requireth to be in our workes, and what want through our corruption there is in the same. But master Bellarmine bringeth some arguments to proue this inherent righteousnesse. The first is out of these words, As by one mans disobediēce many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one many are made iust. Of this argument, because I haue spoken at large, towards the latter ende of the 23. chapter, I leaue the reader to that place. His second argumēt is this, Al are iustified freely by his grace, throgh the redemption that is in Christ Iesus, whom God hath set to be a reconciliation. In which place by grace master Bellarmine vnderstandeth that righteousnesse that God hath giuen, or infused into vs: for so he speaketh. But saint Augustine in that place vnderstandeth by Grace, that which is set against workes. And Primasius saith, By (his grace) because hee paid for vs that which hee ought vs not, that he might saue vs being freely redeemed. Thus doth Augustine and Primasius take this word Grace, for Gods loue to vs, not for any vertue inherent in vs, cleane contrarie to master Bellarmines minde. And by these and some other places he would faine proue, that the worde of iustifying, may sometime signifie an inherent righteousnesse. And what if we grant that to him: yet thereof it followeth not, that that inherent righteousnesse doth iustifie vs before God, which master Bellarmine would faine proue. As for that which he saith of Abel and Noah, that they were accounted iust: if hee will by that commendation that is giuen to them, exempt them from all sin, saint Augustine will be directly against him, who speaking of Iobs righteousnesse, sheweth, that perfection was not in Iob, neither that it can be any. But in comparison of others he was iust. And if perfection cannot be in any, then shall no man

Master. Bellar. his proofe for inherent iustice. De iustif. li. 2. cap. 3. Rom. 5. 19.

Rom. 3. 24. 25.

De gratia Christi cont. pelag. & Celest. cap. 31. Prim. vpon this place.

De peccat. merit. & remiss. lib. 2. cap. 12, 13.

man by any inherent righteousnesse, answere Gods iust
Ber. epist. 54. iudgement. For Our greatest perfection is desire to
bee more perfect, and alwayes to confesse our imper-
fection. Two or three argumentes mo hath maister
Bellarmine in that place, but because they are not woorth
answering, of purpose I omit them, concluding with that
Amb. epist. 32 lib. 5. golden saying of saint Ambrose: not the lawe, but faith
maketh a man iust, because righteousnesse is not by the
law, but by faith.

That good workes are necessarie duties for all Christians to performe.

Chap. 27.

The Protestants

BVt although we denie
that our good workes,
cā any thing merit our iu-
Ephe. 1. 4. stification, yet we affirme
that God hath chosen vs
vnto himselfe before the
foundations of the world
were laid: so, *wee are his*
Ephe. 2. 19. *workmāship, created in christ*
Iesu vnto good works, which
God hath ordained that we
should walke in them. For
the same spirite of God,
that worketh in vs faith,
and maketh it to take sure
hold of Christ, doth also
make it as a fruitfull plant,
to bring foorth fruite in
great abundance of holie
obedi-

The Papists

BVt our aduersaries teach
vs, not to do good workes
for Gods sake, That men Mat. 5. 16.
seing our good works may
glorifie our father which
is in heauen: *but for our*
owne sake, namely to pur-
chase heauen thereby, and to
satisfie for our sins. So that
this is the difference betwene
vs and thē. That good works
should be done, wee crie it as
lowd as they: But we differ
somtime in the worke it selfe:
for wee say, that is onely a
good worke that is done ac-
cording to Gods commande- Mat. 15. 9
ments. They teach for doc- Andrad. Orthod. expli. lib. 5.
trines the precepts of men,
yea,

THE PROTESTANTS.

obedience. Neither can this faith, if it bee a true faith, be idle, but it will worke by loue. By loue, I say, towards God, wherby we will bee readie to loue him, carefull to serue him, and willing to please him. By loue also towardes our neighbour, to the performance of al Christian duties in mercifulnesse, and brotherly kindnesse. For wee know that God hath giuen vnto vs his law, that though we cānot be saued by it, yet we should walke in the same law with our whole indeuour.

THE PAPISTS.

yea, that men may offende God more sometime in breaking the lawes of the church, than Gods law. Which how blaspemously it is written, let the world iudge. We also direct our workes to another end than they do. We do good works to glorifie God, and because hee hath commanded vs, that we may so offer vnto him a sacrifice of obedience. They worke that they may merit thereby, and so do disgrace the merit of Iesus Christ.

And thus much I thought good to set down concerning this point, to stop the mouthes, & to stay the pens of slaunderous papists, who go about to discredit our true doctrine with the simple and ignorant, as though wee spake against good works: when as in truth we exhort earnestly all men, to shew their faith by their workes, and to walke worthy of their calling. Only this we admonish all men out of Gods worde, that they esteeme not as good workes, the foolish fancies of mans heuice: (for wee must giue God leaue, to teach vs what is good, and what is euill, for he is our lawmaker) then also that they refer vnto Gods glory the good workes which they do, and to no other end, and that they do them in singlenes of heart, to performe their dutifull obedience to God. And these points being obserued, we instantly exhort, yea, & command all men, whilest they haue time to do good, and neuer to be wearie of well doing. Gal. 6. 9. 2 Cor.

Of

Of praier: to whom, and how wee shoulde praie.

Chap. 28.

The Protestants

PRaier is a good worke, commended and commanded of God, and therfore to be vsed, a most ready meane to supply our wants, a most sure stay & comfort in all our dangers and distresses, and therefore not to be neglected. For how can we either relieue our necessities better, or in heauines comfort our selues more effectually, than if wee conuerse and talke with God? Which thing wee doe in praier. And therefore the Apostle willeth vs to *pray alwaies, or continually euen without ceasing*: Because we alwaies stand in neede of comfort and helpe. Yea Christ would haue *vs alwaies to pray and not to wax faint*. But wee must aske all good thinges of God

Greg. Nissen. orat. 1. in orat. Dominicam.

1. Thess. 5. 17.

Luc. 18. 1.

The Papists

OVR aduersaries also speake much of praier: but their praiers haue many faultes. For first they praie not to God only, but also to the Saints and creatures, expresly against Gods lawe. Then also they number their praiers vpon their beades, as if they woulde knowe howe much God is become indebted vnto them for their praiers. Thirdly they pray in a tōgue vnknowen to them that doe pray many times, namely in latine. And fourthly out of these ariseth another fault in their praiers, that the praiers that are directed to any other than to God, and are also such, as they that doe praie knowe not what they aske, or what they pray for, because they pray in latine: therefore they praie not in faith, and so their

THE PROTESTANTS

God only, from whom only commeth *euery good giuing, and euery perfect gift.* And that in the name of Christ Iesus, and for his sake. We must also pray in faith if we will be heard, and with vnderstanding that we may pray in spirit.

Iam. 1. 17.

THE PAPISTS

their praiers are turned into sinne, and prouoke God to anger.

First we must pray vnto God only, in respect of Gods commandement. Thou shalt haue no other Gods but me. For thereby God doth challenge vnto himselfe, not only that we should acknowledge him to be God, but also that we should performe to no other but to him those seruices and offices that are due vnto God, amongst which inuocation or praier is one. Secondly, that commandement, which more particularly toucheth this point, Call vpon me in the day of trouble, and I will deliuer thee, is flatly broken if we doe call vpon any other. Thirdly, the prophet Dauid doeth seeme to make it a property belonging to God only, to heare our praiers, Thou that hearest our praiers, to thee shall all flesh come. And therefore if wee will be heard, we must pray to God only. Fourthly, Athanasius proueth Christ to be God, because he is praied vnto in distresse. Whose argument had not beene good, if any other besides God might haue beene praied vnto. Fiftly, faith only belongeth to this life, so that the Saincts haue it not in the life to come, as maister Bellarmine himselfe affirmeth very truely: but praier without faith auaileth not, and How shall they call on him, in whom they haue not beleeued? Therefore the saints after this life cannot pray for vs, or at the least their praiers cannot auaile. Sixtly, as it is not an office laid vpon the saints to pray for vs, in all the scriptures, so they regard nothing in the life to come, but only Gods glory, as may appeare by the exercise of singing praise to God only, as in the Apocalips many,

Psal. 50. 15.

Psal. 65. 2.

Cont. Arian. Orat. 2.

De iustif. li. 3. cap. 4. & 7.

manie times is ascribed vnto them. So little care they haue of their owne priuate estate, much lesse of our affaires, but of those things only, that belong to gods glory. Thus then we see, concerning this first point in controuersie concerning praier, that we must not pray vnto any creature, but to God only. But yet let vs see how M. Bellar. wil proue that we maie praie to the creatures. Iacob saith of Iosephs children, The angell that deliuered me from all euill, blesse the children, therefore Iacob praieth vnto the angel. That which there he calleth the angel is God, as appeareth not only by the words, because before he called him God: but also Chrysostome expounding this place, not once naming the angell, maketh him to aske al these things of God. And that which he alleadgeth out of Iob, is of like force. Call now if any will answere thee, and to which of the saints wilt thou turne? for many of the Hebrews vnderstand this of the saints that are aliue, as if he had said, what good man is of thy mind, or wil take thy part? Some expounde this place of the angels, but so as they make Eliphaz to aske this question (to whom amongst the angels Iob wil turne) scoffingly. As if he had said, if thou shouldst aske of them it were in vaine, they would not answer thee. But howsoeuer it is, it is certaine, that heere is no mention of inuocation or praier vnto the angels, but rather as it seemeth by Philippus Presbiter vpon this place, a taunting reproofe of Iob, if he beleeued not Eliphaz his words. But howsoeuer it is expounded, heere is no good argument for inuocation or praier vnto angels. For the Godly haue often turned themselues vnto the angels, but not to pray vnto them. As for that that Moses said, Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel thy seruantes, respecteth not the merits of these fathers, but the promise made to them, as in that place appeareth: for it followeth, To whome thou swarest by thine owne selfe, and saidst to them. I wil multiply your seede. Which words doe plainely burden God with his promise made to them. Neither doth that which maister Bellar-

De beatitud. Sanct. li. 1. cap. 19.

Popish argumentes for inuocation.

Gen. 48. 16.

vers. 15.

In Genes. Hom. 66.

Iob. 5. 1.

Philippus Presbiter in Iob.

Exod. 32. 13.

Bellarmine alleadgeth out of Theodoret, proue any thing to the contrary. For he saith that Moses vsed the helpe or defence of these patriarkes. And why not rather in respect of Gods promise, which we know hee is able and ready to performe, then of their merits. So that if there were any inuocation or praier to them, as there is not (it is onlie a request that God will remember them) and therefore this place belongeth not to the matter now in question, but if there were any praier vnto them, we see that it cannot bee concluded out of this place that Moses would haue God to regarde their merites. But maister Bellarmine will helpe the matter with a testimonie out of the Psalmes. Lord remember Dauid and al his kindnes. There saith maister Bellarmine, Salomon praieth in respect of his father Dauids merits: but the word vpon which his whole argument dependeth, that heere is translated kindnes may be trãslated Affliction. And S. Hierom trãslating the psalms according to the Hebrew doth so translate it. And how can he thinke with such vncertaine proofe, to make good so bad a cause? But I hasten to that argument, that coulde neuer yet be answered, for so maister Bellarmine saith. And it is this. We may desire them that are aliue to pray for vs, therefore we maie pray to the saints that are departed. If maister Bellarmine had not liked so well of this argument, I should not haue thought it worth any answere. For to praie one for another whilest we are aliue, is both warranted and commaunded of God: but to praie to them that are gone, wee haue neither commaundement nor promise. And there is greate difference betweene praiers, which the papists woulde make to them that are dead, and such requestes as the godlie haue made, or we may make to them that are aliue to praie for vs. But maister Bellarmine will strengthen his argument, by remouing the causes that maie hinder this inuocation, or rather their intercession for vs. First if wee saie they will not praie for vs: hee answereth, they haue greater loue than

Theod. quæst. 67. in Exod.

Psal. 131. 1.

they

they had, and therefore they will. But what manner of loue they haue to vs ward, is not described in the Scriptures: And therefore we cannot of that their loue which is vncertaine, gather any certaine argument. But sure I am, their loue towards God and our sauiour Christ is so great, that they will not rob either God of his glory, or Christ of his office of mediation. And they cannot pray for vs because, as before I haue shewed euen out of maister Bellarmine, that they want faith. And whether they know that we pray or not, it is vncertaine. As for the wrong that is done vnto God, if any but he be praied vnto, which maister Bellarmine imagineth to be the fourth let why they cannot pray for vs: he answereth that if that be any hinderance to Gods glory, it also is against Gods glory, that they who are aliue, should request other to pray for them. Which his answere how foolish it is, the very women and children maie easily perceiue, how the one hath commandement, the other must goe amongst the wil-worshippings: especially if wee consider the practise of inuocation in the popish church. For although now to make some faire shewe of their doctrine, they will teach vs. that the saints Are not the immediate intercessours vnto God for vs, but obtaine our requestes of God through Christ, as maister Bellarmine teacheth: yet it cannot be denied, that men and women haue had confidence in the saint it selfe, haue vowed, and performed their vowes vnto the same for their deliuerance, haue praied vnto the same for helpe. And these men haue not beene reproued, no they were thought to haue a good deuotion, and to merit thereby: but some haue beene accused of heresie for not praying in their trauell to the virgin Mary. Yea they haue published a blasphemous thing, called the Psalter of the Virgin, compiled by Bonauenture, in which whatsoeuer in the Psalmes and some other scripture is spoken of the Lord, is most wickedly by them applied vnto the Virgin Mary, whom they call lady. Yea to be short, it is almost as full of blasphemies as of words. An infinite number of their

Coloss. 2. 23.

De beatitud. sanctil. 1. ca. 17.

Act. & Mon. pag. 1117. 1443.

their owne prayers, might bee brought against them out of their owne bookes to testifie against themselues, of that superstitious confidence which they haue had in the creature: and yet would they now perswade the world, that they neuer meant they should make intercession to God for vs, but by Christ: but in trueth they make them rather gods than mediators. As when the virgin Mary is willed to command her Sonne, and to shew her to be his mother: Or when vnto her they pray thus: In al our trouble and distresse help vs, most holy virgin Mary. And thus haue I thought good, briefly to examine their prooles out of the scripture, and to take away that shew of reasons, that they make out of Gods word. I might haue brought their owne fellowes to testifie against them, that whilest they will seeme to alleadge scriptures, they doe but wrest them. For Eckius a stowt Papist doeth frankely confesse, that the inuocation of saints is not expressly commanded or taught, either in the olde or new Testament. But Melchior Canus better learned than hee, doeth say, that neither plainely, nor yet couertly, it is contained in the Scriptures. And therefore we see that they doe alleadge Gods word, but to blinde mens eies, as though they had some warrant out of it, not because they thinke their arguments proove that which they teach. Seeing therefore their doctrine, is so quite voide of all warrant out of Gods word, and that which they do seeme to bring, is so weake and wrested, as may appeare: I trust I may conclude with Tertullian that this commaundement, aske and yee shall receiue, agreeth to him that knoweth of whome to aske, euen of him of whome somewhat was promised, that is, of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Iacob. Now for the second point, which is, that Christ Iesus is this only mediator between God and man, to offer vp our prayers vnto God. Wherein our aduersaries do not deny but he is the mediator, but they had wont to tell vs, that he is the onely mediator of redemption (and yet

In Enchirid. cap. 15. De Theol. locis li. 3. cap. 3

De præscrip. aduersus hær.

Christ our onely mediatour.

Eckius in Ench. cap. 15

they rob him also of that office, by the Popes pardons, and such baggage) but there may be many mediators of intercession say they: But master Bellarmine hath found out another shift, namely, that they are but intercessours by Christ (as before I haue shewed.) But howe doeth master Bellarmine proue, that the saints make intercession by Christ for vs. Hee hath not so much as one word out of scripture for it, neither yet out of any ancient father. His onelie proofe is out of saint Bernard, who liued eleuen hundred yeeres and more after Christ. Is this a doctrine to be receiued now as catholike, that hath so long beene buried in silence, and will not yet perchance be very well liked of. Indeede, that Christ is our mediatour he proueth well: but that which he would especially haue vs to beleeue, is left without witnesse, as I haue shewed.

De beatitud. sanct. li. 1. ca. 17

Well then, I will take it as a thing granted by master Bellarmine, that Christ is onely our immediate mediatour to God, and no saint, no angel, or any other creature: which thing the scriptures proue plentifully. And I will (by Gods grace) shew also, that they may not be mediators by or to Christ for vs. First, there is no warrant for it in the word, and therefore it must not be receiued of vs, whose rule for life and religion the word must be. Secondly, I haue shewed, that the saints departed haue not faith, and therefore they can not pray. Thirdly, to ioyne them with Christ in the office of Mediation, doeth shewe that they feare, that either hee can not by himselfe performe that office which God hath laide vppon him, and that is blasphemous: Or, that hee will not at our request do it, vnlesse hee be intreated by others.

Seeing hee hath died for my sinnes, shall I doubt whether hee will heare mee if I doe pray? If hee bid mee aske, seeke, knocke, and promiseth then that I shall haue, finde, and to open, will hee not bee as good as his worde? In all thinges it became him to bee made

Hebr. 2. 17

like

like vnto his brethren that hee might bee mercifull, 17
and a faithfull high priest in thinges concerning
God, that he might make reconciliation for the sins of Ebr. 4. 15.
the people. For in that he suffred and was tempted, hee 18
is able to succour them that are tẽpted. Our high priest
is touched with the feeling of our infirmities. Let vs
therefore goe boldly vnto the throne of grace, that we
may receiue mercy, and finde grace to helpe in time of
need. Let vs, I saie, our owne selues come vnto him in
this assurance that he will not faile to heare and helpe vs.
For he calleth Come vnto me all yee that are weary and Mat. 11. 28.
laden, and I wil ease you. Shall we be afraid to draw nigh
vnto him, that calleth vs so louingly? Or shall wee
thinke that wee shall neede to sende mediatours to intreate
him, that sendeth his embassadours to vs to intreate vs?
Nowe we are embassadours for Christ (saith saint Paul) 2. Cor. 5. 20.
as though God did beseech you through vs, wee pray
you in Christes steede, that you bee reconciled to
God.

Let vs therefore saie with S. Augustine, or whosoe- Lib. 2. cap. 2.
uer it was that writ those bookes that goe in his name, Of
the visitation of the sicke. I speake more safely and
sweetely to my Iesus, than to any of the holie spirites of
God. Yea this grosse and absurd persuasion Saint Chry-
sostome in many places seeketh to remoue, as they that do
read his works may finde. God (saith he) wil giue to vs sal- In Matth.
uation not so much at others intreaty, as at our own. And Hom. 5.
this he proueth by the examples of the woman of Canaan, Mat. 15. 22.
the sinnefull woman and the theefe that was put to 24, 25, 26,
death with Christ, and at his owne suite obtained para- 27, 28. Luk. 7
dise. And Chrysostome seemeth in that place to yeeld a Luk. 23. 40.
good reason why we should sue for our selues. Because it 41.
will make vs more carefull to amende our liues, to the
ende wee maie the better please God. So that hereby
wee maie gather, that they who teach vs that wee maie
haue other aduocates or mediatours to God, teach vs to

bee careleſſe of our owne conuerſation howe wee doe liue. Whereas if our ſelues onely muſt of neceſſitie intreate God for his ſonne Chriſtes ſake, wee will be more carefull to ſerue him, that with greater confidence wee may come to intreate him.

This good ſeede of Inuocating and calling vppon God, continued about ſome two hundred yeares in the church vntill that enuious man at the laſt, whileſt Gods ſeruants were aſleepe, did ſowe that euill ſeede of praying to the creatures. And although ſome did like well of it, yet was it miſliked alſo by ſome of the godly, as moſt notably appeareth in Epiphanius againſt the here-
Hæreſ.79 tikes called Collyridiani, who offered a bunne or cake to the virgin Mary, or for her ſake: and of that they had their name. And ſo the Papiſts do offer their waxe candles, yea many times very pretious thinges vnto their ſaints. But Epiphanius compareth ſuch to a common harlot, that runne a whooring from one onely God: and ſaieth this olde errour ſhall not preuaile, to leaue him that liueth, and to worſhip the creature. He will not haue her worſhipped, neither yet that they ſhould offer in her name.
De beatitud. ſanct li.1.ca. 15 Bellarmine indeuouring to anſwere this place, ſaith that Epiphanius reproueth that hereſie, becauſe they woulde make a god of her. But the place is maruellous ſtrong againſt the Popiſh ceremonies, in their ſuperſtitious ſeruices. For Epiphanius gathereth of this, that they did to the virgin Mary, that they made her a god, not that they eſteemed or called her a god (for they neuer denied the one God) but that they did to her that which the Gentiles doe to their gods. And (I pray you) did they any more to the virgine Mary than our Papiſtes doe? Let it be examined. They offered bunnes or cakes in her name: the Papiſts do offer ſundrie ſorts of things: and, the more, and the coſtlier, the Prieſts thinke the better of it. At a certaine day in the yeere ſome women vſed to trimme ſome Waggon, and couer it ouer with a ſheete, and for certaine dayes

woulde set there some breade, and offer it in her name, being assembled together: The Papists make many as pretie shewes as this could be: for, the worship of their Saints haue their dayes set downe for it. The women also doe with those heretikes, celebrate those holie mysteries. Howe many religious orders the Popish church hath to celebrate the mysteries in honour of their Lady, as they doe terme her, let the worlde iudge. But our Papists being compared with those heretikes, goe as neere (I warrant you) to make their saints gods, as euer did the Collyridians to make a God of the Virgine Mary. And howe doeth Epiphanius confute this heresie? What Scripture (saith hee) hath taught vs this? which of the Prophets commaunded a man, much lesse a woman to bee adored? If then the Scriptures must teach vs, and the Prophets must direct vs in our religion: because this inuocation of the creature hath no warrant in the worde, wee may safely reiect it. And that our prayers, whether they bee priuate or publike, must bee in a tongue that wee vnderstand, it is by many reasons to be prooued. For if that prayer bee as Saint Basil defineth it, A requesting of some good thing of God, powred out to God of the godlie: or as Chrysostome saieth, It is a talke with God: or as Damascene doeth write, The ascending of the minde vnto God, or, the craving of thinges fit to be asked of God: then is it most necessary, that whether we pray in publike, or priuatly, we should vnderstand what we say, lest in steed of good wee aske that which is euill, and our talke shoulde not be seemely or agreeable to the maiestie of God, with whom wee talke: neither can our minde ascend in prayer, if the vnderstanding of our words be not as it were a wing to helpe it vp. Therefore Chrysostome exhorteth vnto sobrietie, especially when we should pray, and woulde haue vs in prayer to gather together the powers of our minde, That our minde may accompany our wordes to God,

Prayers must be in a tongue that wee know.

Orat. in Iulitt.

In Genes. hom. 29.

De Orthod. fide li. 3. c. 24

In Genes. hom. 29.

for feare leaſt our prayer turne to our condemnation.

1.Cor.14.14 And moſt plaine is that that the Apoſtle ſaieth, If I pray in a ſtrange tongue, my ſpirit praieth, but mine vnderſtanding is without fruit. Thus then I reaſon: All

1.Cor.14.26 thinges ought to be doone to edifying. But the praiers that are made in a ſtrange tongue that the people vnderſtand not, are not done to edifying, therfore they are not ſuch as they ought to be. This whole argument is ſaint Paules. For the firſt propoſition is his very wordes. The ſecond is neceſſarie to be gathered out of his words. For if ſuch praiers are without fruit, as the apoſtle ſaith they are, then they doe not edifye. For when (ſaieth Baſil)

Regul. breuiores quæſt. 278. the words of the praier are vnknowen to them that are preſent, then the minde of him that praieth is doubtleſſe without fruit, becauſe none is the better for it. For

Quæſt. 278. as the ſame father in his anſwer to the next queſtion ſaieth of the vnderſtanding of ſcripture, ſo may we ſay of praier. he compareth the vnderſtanding of the ſcriptures vnto the taſte of our meate. And ſaieth that men heare profitably, when the vnderſtanding of the word is vnto their minde, as the taſte of the meate is vnto the body. And ſo may we likewiſe ſay, that then we praie with fruit, when in our minde we vnderſtand what we praie for, as well as our mouth taſteth our meat what it is that we eat. Which place of ſaint Paul troubleth maſter Bellarmine ſo, that

De verbo dei lib.2.cap. 16 after that he hath ſeen and vewed many anſwers ſcarce anie can pleaſe him. But at the length hee reſolueth vpon this, that the apoſtle ſpeaketh not of their common prayers, but of ſuch ſpirituall ſongs as themſelues made. But that anſwere will not ſerue the turne. For hee that commaunded that all things that are done in ſuch meetings, ſhould bee done to edifying, would not onelie that ſuch ſpirituall ſongs ſhould bee vnderſtood, but alſo all other their prayers and exercises. And therefore Chryſoſtome thinketh that they who come not to edifie others,

may

may as well be away. And that this edifying should, if not onely, yet especially be regarded, Let nothing (sayeth Primasius) bee in you, wherewith you do not edifie one another. Hom. 30. in 1. Cor. Primas. vpon this place.

And if edifying bee especially to bee regarded in our Christian assemblies, then they that edifie the greatest number, doe eyther winne or confirme most in the fayth, and so doe best seruice to God. And therefore I can not but maruaile at maister Bellarmine, that hee is so willing to defende the verie dregges of poperie, that hee will rather speake agaynst all sence, then hee will seeme to say nothing. Who would once imagine that which hee often affirmeth, that all the people neede not vnderstande the prayers? What then doe they in the assemblie, if they vnderstande not what is sayde? All had woont to say Amen, as maister Bellarmine noteth out of Iustinus Martyr. But saint Paule thinketh it absurde that they shoulde say Amen to that they vnderstande not, therefore all people shoulde vnderstande. De verbo dei lib. 2. cap. 16. 1. Cor. 14. 16

But yet more foolish is that hee sayeth, that the people needeth not vnderstande the prayers, because they are made not to the people, but to God, and it is enough that God vnderstande them. What, is maister Bellarmine in earnest, or but in iest? is hee waking, or but in a dreame? The prayers are made to God, it is true, they should bee so. But the Popish Church will haue vs also to pray in Latine to the Saints, manie of which when they were aliue, vnderstoode no Latine, whatsoeuer they nowe doe. Well, we should pray to God.

But maister Bellarmine will confesse, that in the publike prayers, euery member of the Church should haue his share, which he cannot haue vnlesse his heart ioyne in consent with the words of the minister. So that although God vnderstande what wee would haue, yet that is not

enough, vnleſſe we alſo know what we ſue for vnto God. For it is not in this caſe as it is with worldly princes, as maſter Bellarmine moſt prophanely ſurmiſeth. For although hee for whome another maketh ſuite vnto the prince, needeth not to care whether he vnderſtand or not the wordes that hee that maketh requeſt for him doeth ſpeake: yet if hee make requeſt for himſelfe, it is verie needfull hee ſhould well vnderſtande his owne wordes. Nowe the prayers of the Church, although they bee pronounced by one man to auoyde confuſion, yet they are not the prayers of one, but of the whole Church, and therfore ſhould the whole Church ſay Amen vnto them. So they did in the time of Iuſtine the Martyr and long after: ſhewing thereby that they all had intereſt therein, not onely in reſpect of the benefite that they looked for: but euen in reſpect of that verie ſacrifice of prayer, which the church did offer, wherein they had their part. And this is one part of the communion of Saints, that wee ioyne together in one to prayſe God, or pray vnto him, as one bodie, though manie members, yea, as one minde in manie bodies. And this they did when The Chriſtians looking vp to heauen, ſtretching out their handes (for they were harmeleſſe) bare headed (for they were not aſhamed) yea and without anie to put them in minde to pray (for they praied euen from their hearts) al praying together, prayed for all. &c. as Tertullian reporteth of thoſe times. For theſe their outwarde actions, did ſhew the affection of their minde, and agreement in that they prayed for.

Apolog. 2.

Tertul. in Apolog.

Nowe for the numbring of their prayers vpon their beades, or otherwiſe, I doubt whether it can haue anie colour of excuſe. For why doe they ſcore them vp? Is it becauſe they wil go nothing beyond the number of praiers? or that they may bee ſure to pay God all they owe him? To thinke they can giue him all his due, is too great wickedneſſe. And ſo to ſtint themſelues in their praiers,

Numbring of praiers.

how-

howsoeuer they finde themselues affected to pray, doeth plainely shewe that they knowe not what it is to pray. For if it bee the crie (as one sayeth) of the heart, and not of the mouth: then is it time to make an ende of praying, when eyther our heart is satisfied, in hauing the request that it made, graunted, or else it ware faint, and fall downe as Moses his handes did, that it cannot lift vp it selfe to God. Exod. 17.

And seeing men cannot bee alwayes alike minded in prayer, it is but follie to appoint themselues, alwayes the like measure of prayers. And such prayers are manie times turned into prating and vaine babling. Or doe they number their prayers, that they may say to God: Thou art indebted vnto vs for so many prayers? It may so bee: For such is the foolish imagination of man, when hee once refuseth to bee directed by Gods worde, that there is nothing so absurde, no toy so childish, but they will account it to be a religious seruing of God. And so in this, by a little lippe labour, they seeke to buy those paltrie pardons, of such presumptuous Popes, as wil take vpon them by making a gaine of mens sins, to tread vnder foote the most precious bloud of Christ. But what needed so rich a raunsome, as Christ his bloud, if so vile a price may serue the turne? If I would I might bring manie examples of such pardons, for saying a certaine number of prayers. But it is a filthie sinke, that I loue not to rake in

The ground of this blasphemous doctrine, is the blasphemie of all other blasphemies, the summe whereof was vttered at Trent, in the time of Pope Pius the fourth, by Paulus Guidellus, in the hearing of manie of the fathers. That the Apostles and their schollers, did lay the foundation of Christian religion, vppon their owne bloud and merits, as vpon a most sure rocke, and thereby it came to passe that Christs kingdome was enlarged. Popish blasphemy

What

What greater iniurie could they doe to the bloud of Christ? But this perswasion being once entred, that the bloud of the Saints is so auaileable, they will hope well, if they can mumble vp a number of prayers to please them, that they shall haue pardon of their sinnes for manie yeares. If the Papists bee ashamed of this doctrine, as iustly they may, let them shewe it condemned in that their Councell. If they allowe of it, they are a shame to the name of Christianitie. But, that prayers cannot bee meritorious, it followeth of that which before I haue said in the fiue and twentie Chapter. For if no workes can merit, then not prayer.

The last abuse in prayer, is, that as it is many times nothing zealous, or earnest, so it is not of faith, but without all assured perswasion of Gods goodnesse, or readinesse to heare vs. Yea, many times men speake the words of prayer, neither considering what they aske, or howe greatly they stande in neede to be heard, or to whom they speake, or with what boldnesse they may come vnto him, in respect of his abundant mercies. But because this is rather the fault of the men than of the doctrine, I will not meddle with it. But yet I cannot but maruell at master Bellarmine, who thinketh that a man needeth not in prayer to haue such fayth, as that he is assured thereby that God will heare him, but onely a generall perswasion of his power, will, &c. Against which daungerous doctrine, I will for this time onely say thus much. Our faith the more particular it is, the stronger it is, and the stronger it is, the better holde shall it take of Gods mercies, and the more readily obtaine at Gods hande: Therefore still weakenesse of fayth is reproued. And saint Iames willeth vs to pray in fayth without wauering. But this their generall or historicall faith, is sufficiently confuted, if we compare it with that exceeding great, and particular perswasion of Gods goodnesse, which the Apostle did feele in the eight to the Romans, where hee assureth himselfe that

De bonis operibus in particulari. lib. 1. ca. 9.

Iames. 1. 6.

no

no bodie can condemne him, no, neither yet accuse him, no thing can separate him from Gods loue: which his particular faith also appeareth in many other places, and did make him pray with assurance. And thus I haue (I trust) proued, that wee must pray to God onely. I can aske these things (saith Tertullian) of none but of him, of whome I knowe I shall speede, for it is onely he that giueth it. And that by one onely mediator, betweene God and man, the man Christ Iesus. And wee must pray in humilitie, and yet faithfully. Because although our prayers are not of themselues worthie to bee heard, yet Christ shall offer them vp vnto God as a sweete perfume, as saint Iohn in the spirit of prophecie did see. Rom. 8. In Apolog. 1. Tim. 2. 5. Apoc. 8. 3.

Against Images in Churches, or any where else for Religions cause.

CHAP. 29

THE PROTESTANTS

AND as wee must haue one onely God, in whome we must trust, to whō onely we must pray: so we dare not make vnto our selues any Image of God, or of any creature, to doe any kinde of worship vnto the same. For first God hath commanded vs, that wee should not haue anie grauen thing, nor yet the likenesse of any

THE PAPISTS

BVt the Papists, whome neither Gods commaundment can restraine, neither experience (that teacheth euē fooles) can admonish, though they may dayly see (if themselues were not like their Idols, hauing eyes and see not, eares and heare not) the manifest and manifolde superstitions that by them are crept into their Churches: and although they

Want

THE PROTESTANTS

any thing in heauen, in the earth, or in the waters to worship it. Then also mans great weakenes maketh vs afraide to haue them. Because more easily we wil worship the thing that we see, thē that which we see not. Thirdly, the godlie among Gods people did alwaies carefully take heed therof, coūting it a thing most vnlawfull. Lastly, the best teachers of truth Christ & his apostles, did neuer cōmēd thē to vs but rather the contrary. Which doubtlesse they would haue done, if they had bin needefull.

THE PAPISTS

want all warrant of the word, and haue no example, of the purer times of the primitiue church to induce them thereto: yet doe they dailie set vp those dangerous stumbling blockes in their churches, I meane the Images, before which men doe pray, vnto which men doe bowe and kneele and serue. And that they might the easlier lead men and women to superstition, they will sometime make them to wag their head, moue their eies, fome at the mouth or shew other such signes, that they are either pleased or angry with such as come to them.

And if in anie article of their religion, then sure in this, in my iudgement, they haue a most miserable defence, seeing they cannot commend their Images as thinges commended to them of God, or vsed of the Godly. They can only plead not guilty. Our Images are not Idols. We worship them not with any vnlawful worship. And so all that they can doe, is to excuse themselues from being Idolaters. No it is more then they can doe, considering howe God hath forbidden them, and good men haue detested them. Are they not careless thinke you of their owne, or other mens saluation, that will commend that to the people as good and necessary, whereof when they haue spoken the best they can, they cannot truely saie it is not euill? But let vs see by what arguments they will proue that images are

not

not euil, images I saie that haue anie worship done vnto them. For such images as are not in danger to be worshipped, we speake not against. First they put a difference betweene an Idol and an image, & saie that an Idol is a false likenes of a thing, an image doth truely represent thinges vnto vs. First in matter or substance they will confesse that there is no difference betweene them. For both are made of gold, siluer, wood, stone or such like. Secondly, in forme they agree, for they are like some man or woman. Thirdly, they are of like might or power either against mise or rats, or dust and cobwebs, and alike able they are or rather vnable to helpe themselues, or others. Fourthly, the vse of the Idols that the gentiles had, and that the papists haue is all one. For Eusebius sheweth that the gentiles did vse their Idols as bookes, to learne by them God himselfe and his power, and to expresse and set forth the inuisible things of God, by their images: And Athanasius a little before him affirmeth the same. For he reporteth that such as were the wiser sorte of them said, they were as bookes or letters, wherein they might read and learne to know God. And are they not vsed in the popish church to be laie mens bookes? Let themselues speake. We desire in this cause no other witnesses. Why then saith Athanasius in the place before alleadged, what is there in the image that doth represent God? Is it the matter? What neede was there then that a shape should be giuen vnto it? Or what need we seeke that in few places that is in many? For stone, wood, gold and such like maie easlier els where be found then in churches. Is it the forme, the likenesse of men or other creatures? Why then should it not be thought that men themselues, or other creatures, should more liuelie represent God than their image? Is it the cunning or workemanship? Then men that deuised this skill maie rather teach vs, than the image which they made. Thus we see how this ancient writer doth confute soundlie, not only the opinion that Pagans had of the vse of their

Bellar. lib 2. de Imag. c. 5.

De præpar. Euang. lib. 3.

Contra gent. lib. 1.

Idols.

Idols, but also that popish vse of images to be laie mens bookes. And seeing in al these points they are so like, as if they were twinnes of one birth, why should we doubt but they are al one. But they are not more like in anie thing, than in that definition of an idol which maister Bellarmine himselfe hath set downe. An Idol (saith he) is a false likenesse. But the popish images are false likenesses, therefore they are idols. First the image of God the father to be made like an aged man, which maister Bellarmine liketh wel of, is but a false likenesse. For graie heires, and age, are rather a token of weakenes, than a picture fit to set forth Gods maiestie: and shew him rather to be pitied than powerful. Yea but God appeared (saith M. Bellarm.) to Daniel hauing The haire of his head like the pure wool. It is true, but he bid not Daniel paint him so. He appeared in that shape to Daniel only, whom he had indued with a principal spirit, but did not shew himselfe so vnto the people. He appeared vnto his seruants in sundry shapes not often in one sort, to shew that he must not be made like vnto anie one of them, for none of them all can set him forth vnto vs, as he should be set forth, & therefore if we wil make them they are but lying similitudes. And for the image of Christ, it is but a lying likenesse. For his very shape, or outwarde forme is not by them expressed, but one painteth him after one sort, another after another sort. But the especial things that we should receiue comfort or instruction by, cannot bee painted, his godlines of life, & his office of beeing redeemer and mediator. These things which are the chiefest, the grauer cannot graue, the painter cannot paint. These are liuely described in Gods booke. But they that are most giuen to images, care lest to learne these thinges. And seeing the image cannot teach vs these things, for wee see nothing in it but a stocke or stone, or some other mettall made like a man, which cannot stirre or moue or helpe it selfe, therefore it is a false likenesse. But false also are such images in another respect, namely, because the eie beholding it, draweth

De Imag. li. 2 cap. 5.

The image of God the father.

De Imag. li. 2 cap. 8.

Daniel. 7. 9.

The image of Christ.

the

the minde from the consideration and meditation of better thinges, and hindereth more heauenlie cogitations. And therefore wel saith God by his Prophet Ieremie, Their melting is but falshood, they are vanity and the worke of errours. What profiteth the Image? (saith God by Habacucke) For the maker thereof hath made it an Image, and teacher of lies. These bookes then, they are of a false print, and teach not truelie, but as are idoles, euen so are these images false likenesses. And therefore worthely did S. Augustine finde fault with them Who sought for Christ & his apostles, not in the holy scriptures, but in painted wals. And this is indeed a dangerous falshood, vnder pretence of religion, to draw vs from true religion. And by satisfying the eie with a faire shew, to rob the soule, of the spiritual comfort and instruction. Lastlie, they are like in name also. Which thing although M. Bell. & others would faine deny, yet G. Martin a great enemy to vs euen in this cause, cannot but grant that the greeke word *Idolum* maie signifie an image. And Caietanus also another piller of poperie doth make an idol & an image al one, although M. Bellar. censure him for it. And the Hebrew names are so general, as that they may very wel serue for image or idol: yea there is in the vse of them small difference. Sometime their names shew and tell what they are, as vanities, lies, abhominations, yea dirtie and dungie. Sometime they are called according to their making grauen or molten. Sometime according to the effect that they worke in such as serue them, they are called fleabogs: and where Gregory Martin translateth, they Serued grauen Idols, the word signifieth veration Because idols bring veration to them that serue them, they are so called.

But the words as I haue said, are very general. And therefore vniustly and without cause doth Gr. Martin find fault with our english translations, for translating, Thou shalt not make to thy selfe any grauen Image. For the wordes doe so well beare it, that euen their owne latin

False doctrine cause they intise to lies. Ier. 10. 14. 15. Habac. 2. 18.

De consens. euang. li. 1. cap. 10.

Against our english transla. ca. 3. sect. 15. In Exod. 20.

De imag. li. 2 cap. 7.

Cap. 3. sect. 5 Psal. 106. 36.

Ca. 3. sect. 10. Exod. 20. 4.

clue translation, which they allow so wel of, doth often translate that very word image as we doe, for the most abhominable Idols that are: as the images of the temple of Baal, the idolatrous images which the Israelites made, the images of the Caldeans. And that word which with the Hebrews most properlie signifieth a likenesse or image, doth their old translation translate an Idol, if this word *Simulacrum* doe signifie an Idol, as maister Bellarmine saith it doth. For *Tselamim* wich in Hebrew signifieth likenesses or images, that latin translation calleth *Simulacra* Idols. 2. Cron. 34. 3 Hos. 11. 2. and els where. If the old translatour might indifferentlie vse the wordes that are of one signification, why maie not our translatours do the like, but they must by and by be falsifiers and corrupters: And more evidently to proue that the olde translatour did not acknowledge this nice difference: marke the place that we alleadge against them out of Habacucke, and it will appeare, that he maketh images, & that grauen thing which in this commaundement (Thou shalt not make to thy selfe any grauen thing) is forbidden, all one, putting no difference betweene them. For thus doth hee translate that place. What profiteth the grauen thing, For hee that made it hath grauen it a molten thing, and a false image. Where he plainelie calleth that an image, which before he did translate, as the word doth in truth signifie, a grauen thing. If this be no fault in him, I trust the indifferent reader will not thinke it to be a fault in vs. Well then images and idols agreeing so wel as they doe, in matter, forme, vnabilitie, vse, definition, and name, why maie they not bee birdes of one nest: and whelpes of one litter, one of them taken for the other: If wee also consider how in other places of Scripture the idols are described, and compare those descriptions, with that which we see and know to be in their images, we shall see them to be alike. Their Idols are siluer and gold the worke of mens handes. They haue mouthes and speake not, eies and see not, eares and

2. Kings. 11. 18. Ezec. 7. 20. & 16. 19. Ezec. 23. 14.

De Imag. li. 2. cap. 5.

Habak. 2. 18.

Psal. 115. 4. 5. 6.

heare

heare not, noſes and ſmell not, handes and touch not, feete and walke not, neither make they a ſound with their throate. Are not the images ſuch? Much like vnto this, is that that the Prophet Eſay ſaieth of them, That they muſt be borne vpon mens ſhoulders, they muſt be carried and ſet in their place. So do they ſtand and can not remoue from their place. Though a man crie vnto them, yet can they not anſwere, nor deliuer him out of his tribulation. If this be not true of their images alſo, then wee will confeſſe they are no idoles. And this is a thing well worthy to bee noted, that whereas the vſuall names that the ſcriptures giue idoles are theſe, as maſter Bellarmine confeſſeth, *Elilim*, falſe, or *Auanim*, lies, or *Sheged*, a lie: neither theſe, nor any other of the moſt opprobrious names that are giuen vnto idoles are vſed in the commaundement, Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe any grauen thing, but ſuch a name as they can not deny, but that it may be truely applied to their images. The holy ghoſt thereby preuenting this their ſubtill ſhift, when they ſay that images are not thereby forbidden: for the wordes as wel forbid images as idoles, yea any thing that is grauen: yea, and the ſence of the commaundement extendeth to any thing that is made with handes. For that that man can make, is not fit to be a god. And therefore Moſes that man of God hauing threatned to the tranſgreſſours of Gods lawe deſolation of their land, and captiuitie to themſelues in a ſtrange land, bee addeth: And there ſhall yee ſerue gods the worke of mens handes, wood, and ſtone, which neither ſee, nor heare, nor eate, nor ſmell. Yea Moſes before in that chapter, expoundeth vnto them this ſecond commaundement, and teacheth them what is meant by that grauen thing, and how they ſhould vnderſtand it. Ye ſaw not (ſaith he) any likeneſſe in the day that the Lord ſpake to you in Horeb, out of the midſt of the fire: leſt peraduenture ye might be deceiued and ſhould make vnto your ſelues, any grauen likeneſſe,

Eſa. 45. 7.

Bellarm. de imag lib. 2. cap. 5.

Deut. 4. 28.

Verſe 15, 16

neſſe, or any image of man or woman, &c. Wherein Moſes telleth them, that God appeared not in any forme, becauſe he would not haue them to make any image. In which place I vſe their owne tranſlation, becauſe they may ſee, that not idols only, but images alſo are by it condemned. Laſtly, the very practiſe of Gods people, and the deteſtation that they alwaies haue againſt images, may ſufficiently perſuade vs how they vnderſtoode the commandement. For as Bellarmine ſaith of the Iewes, that after Chriſts time they were moſt ſuperſtitious againſt images, and ſay that they are forbidden by Gods lawes: ſo he and all his fellows will neuer be able to proue, that the godly amõg them would at any time admit of images, vnleſſe it were ſome few that were but to beutify the tẽple, or that God cõmanded to be vſed in the temple, as the beaſts that held vp the caldron, or ſuch like, and the cherubes ouer the arke, which are no proofe for popiſh images. For popiſh images had no commaundement, but the images in the temple of Ieruſalem had. Againe, the images that were in the temple were not praied vnto, or any way worſhipped, as were popiſh images. Yea, and if Bellarmine wil beleeue Ioſephus a Iew, writing of their ſtory, he ſhal find that the Iewes were very ſcrupulous and preciſe in that point, inſomuch as they would not onely ſuffer the emperors image to be placed in their temple, but his verie banners wherein the emperor was painted from the waſte vpward, and thoſe that had the egle painted in them, they would not admit into their city, though no worſhip to them were demanded or looked for: & al becauſe they would not breake the ſecond commandement. Whether they did herein wel or euil, I do not define. But hereby it appeares how they vnderſtood this commandemẽt, which could not haue bin, if their forefathers had at any time before admitted of images, (other than ſuch as God commanded) to be vſed among them. This (I truſt) may ſuffice to proue that images, ſuch as the papiſts ſet in their churches, are idoles:

Lib. 1. de Imaginib. ca. 7

Ioſep. anti. cap. 11. Cap. 4.

and

and that the hauing [illegible]worshipping of [illegible]inst
the second com[illegible]ment. Now let vs [illegible]
ruse themselues [illegible] vnlawfull [illegible]
They say they doe not wor[illegible]nt hon
them as Gods creatures. [illegible]er of the im[illegible] Of the worship of Images.
as the wood or stone is gods creature, & therfore good, & to be
in their kinde to be honoured. But the image it selfe is the
worke of mens hands, & none of gods creatures, but a dan-
gerous stumbling blocke in the way of the simple, & cursed
of God. And this very image it self, to speak in Bellar. own
words, is, to be worshipped not only by accident or im- De imag. li. 2 cap. 21.
properly, but of it selfe and properly, so that the wor-
shippe hath respect but vnto the image considered in it
selfe, not as it representeth that whereof it is an image.
We see then the papistes will haue their images worship-
ped. And then for the external worship, as capping, knee-
ling, bowing, censing and such like, M. Bellarmine confes- De imag. li. 2 cap. 21.
seth, they are al one that are done to God, and to their ima-
ges. So that he thinketh the difference betweene the wor-
ship of God and the image only to consist in this, that in the
worship of God, the mind is in the highest degree humbled,
and abased with an apprehension of God as the chiefest
good. O miserable blindnesse that possesseth the hearts of
these blind guides: how can it bee, that the nature of man,
being so inclining to Idolatry, as the common experience
of all times teacheth vs, hauing his eies fastened vppon
an Image, and hauing a purpose to worshippe it,
shoulde not striue to doe the greatest worshippe that hee
can doe to it, and thinke that all that hee can doe is to lit-
tle? These colours maie well serue the simple, or such
as are willing to be deceiued, to make their eyes dazell,
that they shall not well iudge betweene trueth and fal-
shoode. But I warrant you that whatsoeuer will set him-
selfe deuoutlie to praie before an Image, as they vse
to speake, wil humble himselfe as deuoutly as he can before
the same. As for that their distinction of Latria, which is Latria

Dulia. the worship that they will allow God: and Dulia which is that that other images must be content withall: I neede not stand to confute it. For M. Bellarmine confesseth that these wordes are not of their owne nature proper to diuine worship, but that the schoolemen haue deuised this distinction. Then let the schoolemen play with such toyes, and fight with such babies. But Gods people should be fed with sounder foode. But what meaneth this caueat that

De Imaginibus li. 2. c. 22 M. Bellarmine giueth, that a man must not say, especially when he preacheth vnto the people, that any images are to bee worshipped with that worship that belongeth to God? If it be true, why may not the people know so much? Perchance M. Bellarmine doubteth whether that their opinion will proue true,

Ibid. cap. 20 that the same honour is due to the Image that is due to him whom it representeth. And therefore that the image of Christ should be worshipped with that worship that belongeth vnto God. Indeede these their rules can neuer proue good, because they are not commaunded of God. For it is alwaies

De Monogamia. in such thinges true that Tert. saith, that which the scripture doth not set downe, it doth forbid. Yet learned it of Gods owne mouth, who answered the superstitious Iewes pleasing themselues in such seruices as they had deuised,

Esay 1. 12. who required these things of your hands? But as they haue no warrant for that they teach, and therefore ought not of christians to be heard: so their opinions are in themselues so absurd, that but to shew them, is enough to make such as haue any care of their owne saluation to shunne them. But how shall the afflicted mindes, which would giue all that they haue for a little comfort, vnto whom the feare of death is nothing, in comparison of the terrour of sinne: how shall they finde comfort in the conflicts of conscience, when faine they would aske, but they knowe not of whome: and pray, but they knowe not howe: for, if their teachers and Doctours, at their best leasure, can not yet resolue themselues, how they should

pray

pray vnto their stockes and stones: how shall he that hath to thinke of death, and to striue against the assaultes of sinne, and many feares, knowe in such a case which way to turne him? And therefore, as Cyprian saith to the christians that sacrificed to idoles, O wretched man, why bringest thou an offering with thee? when thou comest to offer or intreate, why doest thou lay on thy sacrifice? Thou thy selfe commest an offering and a sacrifice vnto the altar: thou hast there offred thine owne saluation, thy hope. In those wicked fires thou hast burned thy faith. Euen so I may say to those miserable men and women that are carried away after such vanities, that their owne imaginations shall punish them, and They shall eate the fruit of their owne way, and be filled with their owne deuises. For it is good reason, that he that soweth iniquitie should reape affliction, and see by the sparkes of the fire that he hath kindled.

De lapsis.

Prouer. 1. 31. Prouer. 22. 8. Esa. 50. 11.

What Fasting is: and of the true vse of fasting.

Chap. 30.

THE PROTESTANTS

AS praier is a good work commaunded of God, so is Fasting also in the scriptures commēded vnto vs. But not because it is of it selfe good, or a thing wherein God hath delight, but as it is a meane to humble vs, and make vs

THE PAPISTS

BVT our aduersaries like the rauening fowles that Virgil speaketh of, who defile all that they touch: doe also with their superstitions pollute this christian and necessary exercise: partly, in that they haue in fasting a chiefest regarde to make

What fasting is.

vs more fitte, any way to serue God. And it is an abstinence from all meats and drinkes (but I speake here of such faltes as vpon sudden or extraordinarie occasions the godly haue vsed) & not from flesh only, or from certaine meats: we must therfore fast, not thinking thereby to deserue any thing of God, but only to tame our selues I mean our flesh, which is many times more vnrulye thā is expediēt, & that the spirit thereby may more earnestly come vnto God. Whereby wee learne also the fittest times for fasting to be, either when we see the flesh rebellious, or dangers at hand.

choise of some meates, reiecting others: partly also in that they haue their certaine dayes and tymes, set downe for their fasting, and those many times in the honour of some of their Saints, and doe not regarde such particular occasions as may force men to humble themselues before God: but especially, because they esteeme fasting to bee such a woorke, as is meritorious, and deserueth at the handes of GOD, So that thereby hee is satisfyed, and his wrath and indignation against vs appeased.

Bellar. de bonis operibus in part. lib. 2. cap. 11.

Fasting there is, publike and priuate: And of both sorts there are diuers kinds. But I speake not here of the spirituall fast which is the best, and without the which the other fasting is nothing els but a mockerie. Nether yet doe I speake of that ciuil abstinence, which in some politicke respects is commaunded amongst vs, and is manie times called a fast. But of those fasts only doe I intreat, which are in question betwene vs and that superstitious church of Rome, that we knowing the true vse of fasting may more vse it, and shunne that superstitious and popish maner of fast. Sometime the cause of fasting, is the mortifying of our flesh, by denying the bodie that wherby it is puffed vp and made wanton and rebellious. Sometime

some imminent daunger which wee see hanging ouer our heads or not far of, or some feare of Gods wrath doth moue vs vnto it. And this is for the most part publike and not alwaies after one maner: for some fasted the whole daie from eating or drinking anie thing: Some did fast so three daies together as Hester commaunded the Iewes. Then was there another kind of fast wherin they did not abstaine from all meates and drincks, but from delicate fare. So Dauid fasted seuen daies when his child was sicke. So also did the people when Saul was dead. And Daniel fasted three weeks, all which time he did nether eat pleasant bread, nether came flesh nor wine in his mouth. But these are for the most part priuate fasts, although not alwaies: for we see the people did fast after Saule was dead, as it seemeth, publikly seuen daies. And of the first cause of fasting, which I haue said is the mortifying of our flesh, and making vs more fit to serue God, perchaunce we haue an example in Anna, who serued God with fasting, and praier night and daie.

Iudg. 20. 26 Hest. 4. 16.

2. Sam. 12. 17 1. Cro. 10. 12 Dan. 10. 2. 3.

Luke 2. 37.

But of the second cause of fasting, wee haue in the Scriptures manie examples. Ioshua 7. Iudges 20. and in manie other places, which for shortnesse I omit. And doubtlesse there is a great fault, I must needes confesse, in this our realme in this poynt, that that viperous generation of popish tyrants and traitours, seeking so many wayes, by poysoning, fire, murthering, and all villaynous practises to roote out the trueth, to make hauocke of this our Countrey, and to shorten the most quiet gouernement and happie dayes of so mercifull and gracious a prince, of whose most gentle regument, they haue no iust cause to complayne, vnlesse it bee that of her tender, and euill rewarded clemencie, and gentlenesse, shee suffereth such daungerous popish snakes, so neere her bosome, euen in all partes of the Realme, so vntouched and almost vnregarded, wee, I say, seeing with our eyes, and dayly hearing with our

eares of these pestilent, and brutish, and most vnnaturall practises, and manifest daungers, doe not humble our selues before our God in fasting and prayer. Why doe wee not followe the infinite examples of the godly, of all ages, and the good practise of our neere neighbours on euerie side almost, in such present perill to proclaime a fast, that with the Niniuites wee might crie mightily
Ionah.3.8. vnto God? But as our enemies haue forgotten that they are men, and casting off all humane nature, are become more brutish than beastes in their practices, and shame not of anie thing that they can doe, so that they may worke wickedly enough: so wee on the other side doe not consider, that through our sinnes we haue deserued all these shakings of Gods roddes ouer vs, and threatnings of his wrath. And that is the cause that wee seeke not by publike fastings and prayer to make a publike conuersion vnto God, against whome so publikely wee haue sinned. God moue the hearts of them that are in authoritie, to rowse vp themselues at the length, to thinke better of their duetie in this poynt, and of our common saftie. For surely hee that was angrie with his owne
Esa.22.12, 13 people, because When hee called to weeping and mourning, and baldnesse, and girding with sackecloth, They continued in their careleste life that before they led, so that hee sayd, that Iniquitie should not bee
14 purged but by their death: howe can hee but punish, and that seuerelie, so little regarde in vs, of his so manie and manifest proclamations of his conceyued anger against vs.

And thus would I with one breath, if I could, both moue our godly Magistrates as occasions are offered, to make this our realme better acquainted with this most Christian and godly exercise: and also let our aduersaries, see that it is not fasting that we speake against, but the abuse thereof, that we iustly reproue. Why then, we confesse that fasting is good and commendable, it is a most

godly

godly and necessarie exercise to bee vsed. But not euerie abstinence is true fasting. First we see, the true vse of fasting is not in the popish church: For the godly did ioine fasting and prayer togither, not thinking that outwarde humiliation to be of it selfe a thing that God regarded, but it was vsed and practised that they might be more apt to pray, as wee may see in the examples that the Scripture ministreth vnto vs. And therefore saint Hierome writing vnto Demetrias sayth, that Fasting is not it selfe a perfect vertue, but the foundation of other vertues. And most plainly saint Chrysostome. Prayers must alwayes goe with fasting. And afterwards, You see that fasting standeth in neede of this helpe. And in another place, he seemeth not to make any great account of their fasting if it be alone. But the papists do say, that it doth appease Gods wrath, and that it meriteth forgiuenesse of sinnes. For this is their common doctrine, and this doth master Bellarmine endeuour to proue. The children of Israel (saieth he) fasting with Samuel appeased God, and got the victorie ouer their enemies. In deede there is once mention of fasting in that place. But the storie sayth that Samuel promised to pray for them, whē that they wept: for that he meaneth when hee sayeth, They drewe water, meaning out of their hearts, they fasted and confessed their sinnes: and so little they regarded the merit of their fasting, that they could not satisfie themselues therewith, but they also desire Samuel to pray, yea, that hee would not cease to crie vnto their God for them. Samuel offered a sacrifice, and prayed for the Israelites. Marke then howe deceitfully maister Bellarmine hath dealt in this place. The people wept in abundance, confessed their sinnes, craued Samuel his prayers to God for them: he offereth sacrifice and prayeth to God to appease his wrath: & yet maister Bellarmine like a subtile sophister, to make men beleeue that that is the cause which in deede is not, speaketh nothing of all these meanes that they vsed to intreate God, but

Epist. ad Demetr.

Hom. 29. in Genes.

Hom. 10. in Genes.

De bonis operibus in part. li. 2. ca. 11.

1. Sam. 7. 6. 8. 9.

onely

onely of fasting, as though that onely had turned away Gods wrath, and yet wee see by the storie, they made least account of it, but especially of praying. Neither is this a good argument: They did fast and God deliuered them: therefore their fasting merited this their deliuerance. His seconde proofe is out of the example of Achab, who may in deede bee a good patterne of popish meriting, for he continued wicked still. But hee is in this, much like as faithfull as the other: For Ahab rent his cloathes, and put on sackcloath, fasted and lay in sackecloath, and went softly as men vse to doe in heauinesse. So manie tokens of sorrowe or feare did Ahab shewe, and yet master Bellarmine could see nothing in him but fasting. And in the storie of the Ninuites, which is the thirde example, they put on sackecloath, sate in ashes, fasted, (but farre otherwise than the Papists doe, and therefore what is this to their fast) cried mightily to God, turned from their wickednesse, and God sawe (not their fasting onely) their workes: but master Bellarmine can see nothing in them but their fasting. In deed in his fourth example which is the storie of Hester there is no mention in the place cited by him, of anie thing that was done, but Hester commanded a fast. But shall we imagine that they did not otherwise humble themselues but onely by fasting, nor seeke to intreate God by prayer, as though this fasting could deserue that they desired? God forbid. For in the ninth Chapter hee saieth, they did not fast onely, but pray also. But as before I sayde, because they did these things and God deliuered them, doeth it followe that all the workes that they did, merited their deliuerance. Master Bellarmine can neuer proue that argument. Much lesse then shall hee be able to teach, that fasting alone could merit. And that is it hee would proue, and in deede that hee should proue, or else hee proueth nothing to serue his purpose. They fasted likewise in the storie of Iudith: but they also prayed earnestly, put on sackecloath, sprinkled ashes

1. Kin. 22. 27. 29

Ionah. 3. 7. 8

Hester. 4. 16

Hester. 7. 31.

Iudith 4. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15.

on

on their heades, afflicted themselues maruellously, offered burnt offerings continually, and the peoples free gifts, crying vnto the Lorde with all their power. Lastly he alledgeth out of the Prophet Ioel, Turne to the Lord with fasting, weeping, and mourning. What then will he conclude of that, that these things merit or deserue Gods wrath to be turned away? He cannot proue it. We denie not but God looketh vpon these things, but not for the merit of them, but for his owne mercies: And therefore master Bellarmine hath not yet prooued that fasting doth merit. And this is the thing that hee should proue. But on the contrarie, in our fasting we acknowledge our selues to bee vnworthie of Gods creatures, and that by our sinnes wee haue depriued our selues of the vse of his benefices, and deserue not euen these his ordinarie graces, which the verie beastes themselues maie freely enioy. And in this hearty acknowledging of our owne vnworthinesse, wee prostrate our selues before Gods mercie seate, seeking for mercie, not pleading, but fearing and refusing our merit. Ioel. 2. 12.

A true vse of fasting.

Now, of this popish opinion of merit by fasting, hath sprung vp another abuse in fasting, That the papists haue dedicated these their fasting dayes, not onely to the seruice of God (for they supposed that they could by such meanes please him, whereas it is all one to him, whether wee come full or fasting, so that wee come so, as our hearts may bee most fitte to serue him) but also to the honour of their Saints, imagining thereby to deserue some fauour at their handes. And for this cause did they deuise to fast vpon their Saintes Euens, and at such other times, as wee see the Popish Church vseth, not so much to tame the flesh, for that fasting we also affirme to be necessarie, neither yet in any politike respect, which belongeth not to our question: but euen because they foolishly thinke that in so doing they worship God and the Saints, and do a thing acceptable to him. And to this ende is also

Of popish fasting dayes.

appointed

appointed their lent fast, their wednesdaie and fryday fast, saterday fast, embar fast, the fasts of aduent and rogation weeke. But that these cannot be accounted times of necessitie to be kept and obserued for fasting in respect of any religious obseruation of the same, it cannot better be proued, than by that diuersitie of opinions and iudgement, which M. Bellarmine himselfe is forced to confesse to be in the ancient fathers. As they shall vnderstand that reade of the booke before alleadged the fifteeneth, the seuenteenth, eighteenth and nineteenth chapters. As for their fastes vppon saintes eues, they come after al the rest. Seeing therefore there is herein such diuersitie, it is plaine enough, that neither any certainty of doctrine can heere be gathered, neither can they cal it a catholicke religion, that is like Iacobs coate of many colours, farre from vnity of faith. But with saint Hillary I maie say, It is most hard for a man by the doctours of this world, to vnderstande the meaning of heauenly precepts. And this I could wish, that at al times we would striue, by this and other good meanes, to tame our rebellious flesh: and that we also would prepare our selues vnto the holy exercises of our religion, either by this or anie other way that maie further therein: but that fasting it selfe doth make vs acceptable to God, wee must not thinke. And out of this their opinion of the merit of fasting, ariseth another most absurd doctrine of binding the conscience to their lawes of fasting, as the church of Rome teacheth with one consent, as M. Bellarmine confesseth. And he wil proue it by the example of the Rechabites, who vpon the commandement of Ionadab their father, abstained from drinking of wine. A weake moofe. The Rechabites obeied the politicke lawe that their father Ionadab gaue them: therefore the church may binde mens consciences with the law of fasting. It is one thing to bind the conscience, another thing to require external obedience. The fast and holie daie which is commaunded to be continued in the storie of Hester is like vnto it, for a day of remembraunce of Gods

De bonis operibus in part, li. 2.

In ps. 118. A

Their lawes of fasting bind not the conscience.

Li. 2. de bonis operibus in part. ca. 7. Ierem. 5. 6.

Hester. 9. 31.

great

great benefit towardes them, but not to binde the conscience. Such also is the fast mentioned in Zachary, of the fourth, fifth, seuenth and tenth monethes, which although it might perchance vppon good and godlie consideration be taken vp, and we debarre none, but exhort all persons to humble themselues vnto the Lord: yet how little their conscience is bound thereto, it partly appeareth, because God saith in the former Chapter that they did not fast vnto him, and willeth them to harken vnto the ministerie of prophets, and to execute true iudgement, and shewe mercy and compassion euery man to his brother. & not to oppresse: for these are in deede good workes that God regarderh, in comparison of which hee little esteemeth those their fastes. Partlie also because God will turne their fasting into feasting, into ioy and gladnes and prosperous high feastes, as there he saith. And lastly he bringeth that law that the apostles set downe, of not eating the blood and things strangled. A law I saie, made by the direction of Gods spirite, as there is witnessed for a lawe: whereof they can finde no such praise. A law that was made according to the necessity of that time, to auoide diuision, and for the better vniting and gathering of the church of the Iewes and gentiles, as M. Bellarmine confesseth, and therefore such a law, as lawfully might be made. For in thinges indifferent, the church maie take order for the quietnes of anie other waie for the benefit of the same. Whereby they would establish a law for euer to binde the conscience. A law I say, which themselues will confesse we are not bound vnto, but doe against that law that the apostles made. But how could we breake that law if it bound the consciences? Or if it doe not binde the conscience, why doth M. Bellarmine bring it to proue that the church may tie or bind the consciences of the faithfull, vnto their lawes of fasting?

Act. 15. 29.

Thus we see that not one of all the places alleadged by him out of the scripture, doth proue the necessity of these lawes of fasting, which so straitly they command. There-

fore

Difference of meates.

fore by the weakenes of their proofe, we may see the falsenes of their doctrine. Now I come vnto the last point of their doctrine which we mislike, which is the difference of meats that they make. Wherein if they doe not conspire with the Ebionites and sundry other heretickes that did condemne flesh as a thing vnpure: yet it seemeth that they haue bin brought vp in the schoole of the heretickes called *Apostolici*, of whom S. Bernard reporteth that they would eate no whit-meate, milke and whatsoeuer came of it, or whatsoeuer was ingendred. But our aduersaries tel vs, that the Ebionites, Tatianites, Maniches, Priscillianists, and such other heretickes, doe vtterly condemne flesh, as vncleane or vnlawful, to be eaten at any time: But themselues thinke it only at certaine times vnlawful. Admit it be so. If they will not goe in the rancke with the old heretickes, let it then be an heresie, deuised (in such sort as now it is) by popish heretickes. For if heresie be, Whatsoeuer sauoureth against the truth, although it be euen an olde custome, as Tertullian very wel defineth it, then doubtles this popish forbidding of certaine meats for conscience sake, will be found heresie. For the truth saith, that they who commaunde to abstaine from meates which God hath created to bee receiued with giuing of thankes, depart from the faith, giue heede vnto spirites of errour, and doctrines of diuels, and that they speake lies through hipocrisie, and haue their consciences burned with an hote iron. But the church of Rome teacheth, that this is a catholicke doctrine, a sounde religion. And they that teach it are good catholickes. The church of Rome then sauoureth against the truth, as in manie other articles so in this also, and therefore it is hereticall. But I knowe their answere, that Saint Paul speaketh against the Ebionites, Tatianites, and such heretickes as did vtterlie condemne flesh as an vncleane thing of it selfe. It is true hee doth so, but not against them onlie, but rather against the popish heresie than against anie other. And

Serm. 66. in Cantica.

De violandis virginibus.

1. Tim. 4. 1. 2. 3.

that

that for these reasons. First the circumstance of the time moueth me to it. For he saith that these men shal be in the latter time. Nowe it were absurde to thinke, that he that speaketh heere by the spirite of prophesie of this false doctrine, should account for the latter times the times of those heretickes, the world indureing so long after as now it hath done. And Ebion that was the first, as I remember, that deuised that heresie, liued in the daies of the apostle, and did sow his seede of that heretical doctrine, verie soone after the apostles death. Yea and Tatian also taught the same heresie, about some seuentie yeares after Saint Paul. If therefore had saint Paul ment of that heresie especially, he woulde neuer haue pointed so farre, as to haue tolde vs of the latter daies, but rather woulde haue said, that it were at hande. The apostle therefore had respect chiefly to more dangerous heretickes than they were, that could carry the matter more cunninglie than wholy to condemne the creature. His wordes also are verie plaine if wee marke them well. For he doth not saie that they shal condemne or dispraise meates, which God hath made, which was the heresie of those olde heretickes: But, they shall commaunde others to abstaine from them, to refuse them, not to receiue them: and this is flat the heresie of the papists. And the apostle confuting this heresie, doeth not commend the goodnesse or pureneſſe of the creature, as it had beene needefull for him to haue done, if hee had chiefly ment his wordes against them: but hee sheweth the lawful vse of the creature, that it is to bee receiued, and it is not to be refused. Which especially armeth vs against the Romish infection, for to speake as Saint Ambrose doeth vppon these wordes, When such doctrines are hearde, we maie knowe the diuel hath deuised them. 1. Tim. 4. 1.

Ambrose vppon these wordes.

Thirdly, the apostle seemeth to haue regard vnto such as shoulde teach the doctrine vnto that ende, that some in his daies did among the Colossians, to put some religi-

on:

on in these outward and bodily exercises, exhorting them thus: Touch not, tast not, handle not, which all perish with the vsing, and are after the commaundements and doctrines of men. And therefore the apostle saith by and by after, that Bodily exercise profiteth little. Amongst which bodily exercises saint Ambrose countech fasting. And thus in deed doe the papists vse their fasts, thinking that a little pinching of their body, should satisfie for their sinnes. Against which foolish perswasion it is a sufficient confutation to saie with the apostle, Let no man iudge you in meates and drinke. Let no man thinke you worse, for eating, or better for not eating. For the kingdome of God is not meate and drinke, but righteousnes, and peace, and ioie in the holy ghost. Now I cannot but maruel, seeing the apostle willeth vs to abstaine from all appearance of euil, what is the reason that our aduersaries wil come so neere those heretical opinions, which are so condemned by the godly of al ages, and doe not rather seeke to worship in spirite and truth as our saiiour Christ telleth vs we must doe, than to put any holinesse in these external obseruances, which wee see so many heretickes haue delighted in. I would therefore exhort our aduersaries to be more wise in that point: for they get them an euil name, by hauing so great a smacke of such corrupt opinions, and haue bad lucke in the choice of their obseruances, wherein they notwithstanding repose a great piece of holines. For those two things wherein they suppose they commend themselues very much vnto the world, which is forbidding of marriage to some sort of men, and meates at some times to al, and at al times to some men, doe most euidently bewray their superstitious religion. Wherein they are not only noted before of the apostle, and pointed at to be bad teachers, but also almost al those heretickes that condemned flesh as vnholy, were also enemies to marriage, as in part at the least the papists are. And thus whilest they will seeme more holy then others, in not vsing holily and with thankes giuing,

Colos. 2. 21, 22

2. Tim. 4. 8.

Colos. 2. 16.

Rom. 14. 17.

1. The. 5. 22.

Iohn. 4. 24.

Gods

Gods good ordinance and creatures: they come so neare those prophane and wicked heretikes that haue gone before them, that al good men take them to be a branch out of that roote, and water of the same spring. But what arguments haue they to iustifie this their doctrine? Master Bellarmine can affoorde vs but one, that maketh any shewe of proofe, that flesh is more vnlawfull to be eaten than other meates, and that but a simple one. It is out of Daniel where he saieth, I haue not eaten any pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine in my mouth. Master Bellarmines arguments are like to fruit that sheweth faire at the first, but is rotten at the heart. For, what can hee proove out of this? Daniel abstained from flesh, therefore no man that will chastice his body must eate flesh. First, that that Daniel did, is no lawe to vs, because it is not commanded vnto vs. Secondly, he did it but for a time, namely, for three weekes: what is this to proove that it must be a continuall lawe for fasting? He did it voluntarily: what warrant can that be to force other men to it? But to come to the very point. I would aske of our aduersaries, whether they thinke that Daniel commendeth vnto vs his fast, in that he abstained from flesh onely, or that hee abstained from all dainty fare? If because he abstained from al daintie fare (as saint Hierome in plaine wordes doth expound it, then it maketh nothing for the forbidding of flesh onely. But that is it that the Papists so stiffely maintaine, and so superstitiously hold, that they suppose themselues more to breake their fast, in eating but one bit of flesh, be it neuer so meane, or of little nourishing, or neuer so little whitemeate, than if they should eate a sufficient meale of daintie and nourishing fish. Now if one should aske them whether one bit or lesse of flesh doeth more pamper our bodie, than a good quantitie of daintie fish, our aduersaries must needes confesse, that a sufficient meale of the one, nourisheth more than the small quantitie of the other. And yet a crumme of flesh doeth breake their fast, and a meale

Bellar. de bonis operibus in part. li. 3. cap. 5.

Dan. 10. 3.

Hiero. in Dan. cap. 1.

of fish doth not. So that they make the vnlawfulnesse to be in the meate it selfe: which, howe neere it commeth to the former heresies, let the world iudge. If they doe answere, that the commandement of the church doth make it vnlawfull: I reply, that the church hath not power to take away our christian liberty, neither must in things indifferent set downe a constant and continuall order, for al times and places. And also the reason that master Bellarmine giueth, why the church forbade flesh, is, for taming of the flesh, which in this case set downe is more pampered by the fish. And therefore the very respect that their church had in giuing this commandement, maketh not simply against the vse, but against the abuse of it. So that still the strait forbidding of the vse of flesh, with such scourings, washings, and cleansings of any thing that hath come neare flesh as they vse to haue, seemeth to come from no other but those ancient heretikes. But they will not be compared to them: Yet they must not take scorne to be yoked with the Manichees, whose fastings saint Augustine describeth, as like the Popish fasting as one egge can be like an other, not in their diet onely, but in their opinion of it also. For hee there sheweth how the Manichees vsing in their fasts, daintie fare, and much spice, and costly drinkes, would yet preferre their fasts before an other that had not touched a peece of restly bacon with his lippes, whose follie hee much inueyeth against. And who knoweth not, that the fasts of many (euen of them whom they call religious men) amongest the Papistes are more nourishing vnto the body, than the best feast that many a poore man getteth throughout the whole yeare. Yea, one draught of their spiced cuppes, is much better than his Christmasse dinner? And yet these men, whose meanest meale should bee a poore mans feast, are saide to fast. And the other, whose greatest fare is with scarcitie, doth not fast. Let our fast then bee an abstinence from anie thing that may pamper the flesh, yet not superstitious.

De operibus bonis in part. lib. 2. cap. 4.

De moribus Manichæorum li. 2. c. 13

not

not ioyned with opinion of merite, not thinking any meate vnlawful, but in Christian sorrow for sinnes to humble our selues.

Of Purgatorie.

Chap. 31

The Protestants

AS for Purgatory wee know none, neither any purgation for our sin, or anie remedie for the same, *but only that bloude of Christ which clenseth vs from all sinne*. Only that *Lambe of God that taketh away the sinnes of the world*, by vertue wherof becauſe wee knowe our sinnes are satisfied for, and we reconciled vnto God, as here we cānot, so els wher we need not make other attonmēt with god for them. For he that is so purged *shall not perish, he shall not come into condemnation, but hath passed from death to life*, as he that cānot lie, hath told vs.

1. Iohn. 1. 7.

Iohn. 1. 29.

Iohn. 3. 16. Iohn. 5. 24.

The Papists

OVR aduersaries teach, that because there are sinners which are not in Christ fully purged, and wee may perchance die before we haue done due penaunce, or fully satisfied for our sinnes: therefore there is no remedy but to purgatory we must go. For although we be reconciled to God by Christ, and receiued to his fauour, yet is not that sufficient to bring vs to heauen, vntil we, or others for vs, haue added somwhat to that satisfaction of Christ. And he that will teach contrary to this, is accounted accursed by the councell of Trent.

Conc. Trid. Sess. 22. ca. 2.

Cens. Colon dialog. 10.

Cens. Colon ibidem.

Se. 6. Can. 30

The absurditie of this their doctrine, maketh me loath almost to meddle with it: for, what christian eares can

The blasphemous saying of the counsell of Trent, & the Iesuites.

heare the blasphemy of the councell of Trent in the place before alleadged, that there are some (they meane of such as shall dwell with God) that are not fully purged in Christ. And yet the scriptures do onely and wholy ascribe vnto Christ, our perfect redemption, whereof his bloud is the price, his death is our ransome. Or, who can but detest the folly of those Iesuites, who are not ashamed to write, that God receiueth such to fauour, as he wil not suffer to come where he is, vntill they haue satisfied for their punishment? No, they blush not to affirme, that God is like to a froward man, who although he can be content by intreaty to forgiue, yet will he not forget the offences that are committed against him, but will haue them punished with temporall punishments, either here or else-where. Which not to be true, among other the theefe vppon the crosse may teach vs. For what satisfaction did hee make for his temporall punishment? None at all: for Christ said to him, This day shalt thou be with mee in Paradise. Yea this example prooueth, that it is not according vnto Gods iustice so to deale. For if hee being a malefactor, had no punishment enioyned vnto him, but were freelie pardoned, howe can wee imagine that God will deale more hardly with other? Againe, to say that wee must make any satisfaction, is to ouerthrowe that free grace and mercy of God, and the only merit of Iesus Christ, and so to diminish the benefite that wee haue of his gratious goodnesse, or to charge him with weakenesse and impotencie, as though hee were not able without our satisfaction for our sinnes, to take away the same. And how doubtfully they set downe this their doctrine, their Writings doe testifie, to beare witnesse of their owne vncertaintie of that which they doe teach. For, Allen that most vnnaturall countrey man of ours (but he that sitteth in heauen, hath defeated his purposes, and laughed him to scorne) concerning this point hee thus setteth it downe, that Often there remaineth a due temporal punishment for satisfaction.

Luc. 23. 43

tisfaction. And master Bellarmine saith, that al the temporall punishment is not alwayes pardoned with the sinne. And the Iesuites of Colen say, that this commeth often to passe. And so they all teach, that not alwayes, but often it is so. But this is a very doubtfull doctrine for the afflicted conscience that would faine finde comfort and release of sinnes. But so must it alwayes be, nothing but doubting, nothing but wauering, so long as wee trust to our owne satisfactions. No quietnesse and securitie, but onely in Christ. But because I haue spoken else-where of our satisfactions or workes, how little auaileable they are, I meane not to stay vpon this point. But for the example of Dauid, which is alleadged both by Allen, maister Bellarmine, and the rest, whereby they chiefly moeuout to prooue, that punishment may be inflicted, the sinne being pardoned, it maketh little for them. For seeing there are in sinne two things, as themselues will confesse, the verie corruption it selfe, and the danger or condemnation that followe h it: the condemnation being taken away by forgiuenesse of sinne, yet the corruption or infection of sinne still remaineth (as before hath beene taught in the three and twentieth chapter. God therefore sometime chastiseth his seruants to humble or reforme them: So he chastised the Iewes. Sometime to trie and prooue them whether their hearts bee right or not: so did hee prooue the Israelites in the wildernesse fortie yeeres. Sometime to glorifie his owne name, and for example to others: as in the storie of Iob appeareth. Then they can not reason thus: Dauid was afflicted: therefore it was to satisfie for his sinne. For God wee see may send affliction for many other causes, and not that wee might satisfie any thing by temporall punishment. But master Bellarmine replieth against this answere out of the very wordes. For there it is saide, Because thou hast caused the ennemies of the Lorde by this thy deede to blaspheme, the childe that is borne to thee shall surely die. Where he noteth

Defence of Purgatorie chap. 1. De purgat. li. 1. cap. 7. Centur. Colon. dal. 19.

2. Sa. 12. 14.

The cause of chastisements. Esa. 48. 10.

Deut. 8. 2.

2. Sam. 12. 14.

the cause laieth master Bellarmine, why Dauid should be punished. True, but not thereby to satisfie for that he had done: But that the enemies of God seeing the chastisements that God laieth vpon his children, and how that Gods iudgements begin euen at his owne house, and
1.Pet.4.17. with his owne deare seruants, they may the rather looke for his heauie wrath, if they turne not to him. And thus much for the right vnderstanding of the place. But what is this to purgatorie, for Dauids sinne was mortall, and therefore could not be helped by purgatorie, by their
De purgat. li. 1, cap. 9. owne doctrine: for M. Bellarmine saith, they al agree therin. To what end then doe they bring in Dauids punishment for a mortall sinne, to shew howe God will take away veniall sinnes: or howe doth it folow, Dauid was here punished for his sinne, therefore all men here or elsewhere must be punished. But to handle this question as briefly as I can, master Bellarmine himselfe, doth handle
Iren. lib. 5. it doubtfully, and so vncertainly, yea, and as Irene speaketh so vnconsequently, and so euil agreeing with it selfe, that he giueth iust cause to suspect the truth of it. Where
Bellar. de purg. li. 2. c. 6 the place of purgatorie is they haue not yet agreed, but are
Cap. 6. of eight sundrie minds. And although in the first booke of purgatorie master Bellarmine hath alledged sundrie
Cap. 1. fathers for proofe of it: yet in the second booke he telleth vs that they are not agreed of it, who shall come thether. Some will haue all but Christ, neither will exempt from thence so much as the virgin Marie, others are of another minde. But who must satisfie for them that are in purga-
De purg. li. 2. cap. 17. torie: only he that is iust. Why then where shall they finde priests to serue the turne. For they are cõmonly as bad as who is worst. And the time will scarcely serue them to
Li. 2. cap. 10 de purgat. recken vp their owne, much lesse shall they be able to satisfie for others sins. Other doubtes also there are which M. Bellarmine speaketh of, but cannot certainly resolue. Is this doctrine to be receiued as catholicke, of so manie points whereof euen the greatest Doctours among them

vs disagree. No certaine place, no certaine people, no certaine proofe of it. What should we doe with such an vncertaine religion, especially where so little good commeth towardes vs, and so much of our gooves goe from vs? For onely veniall sinnes they tell vs, can bee taken away by purgatorie. But for such small faults, because they doe not (as the Papists would make vs beleeue) turne vs from God, they can tell vs manie no easie remedies, Holie bread, holy water, giuing a little almes, pardons, Pilgrimages, Pater nosters, and Auies. And to bee buried in a Monkes Cowle, and bootes, it is a soueraigne remedie for such things, or else they lie. But one thing I cannot but muse at, that in this life these veniall sinnes maie so easilie bee satisfied for, as they all agree: and yet after this life their torments shoulde bee so grieuous as they report them to bee. For maister Bellarmine bestoweth a whole Chapter to proue the paines of Purgatorie to bee most bitter, and that no torments that are in this life, may bee compared with them.

Veniall sinnes onelie taken away in purgatorie.

De purgat. li. 2. cap. 14.

Can a little holy water wash them awaie heere, and must the fire be so sharpe that must burne them awaie else-where? But I thinke I knowe nowe the mysterie of it. The more that mens sinnes are heere mittigated, or the lesse grieuous that they appeare vnto their iudgement, the lesse carefull will they bee to satisfie for the same heere, or rather to auoyd them, and will liue more securely. But when vppon their death-bed, they shall finde anie conflict of conscience, and can finde no rest, then must they giue much for Masses and Trentals: then must the bellowes of the Priests false and lying tongues, blowe the fire of purgatorie, vntill they haue made it so hote, that a great peece of that which hee hath left behinde him, and shoulde serue for the maintenance of wife and children, must bee bestowed in the slaking of that

great heate, and the quenching of that tormenting, and vnsatiable fire.

De purgat. lib. 4. cap. 3. Now for his proofs of purgatorie out of the scriptures, they haue either so little waight, or are so obscure, and so wrested from their natural sense, that the simplest (if without partialitie they could weigh them) would find them too light, to satisfie their consciences to be perswaded of the truth of that doctrine. The two first, the one of the Ma-
2. Mac. 12. Tob. 4. chabees, the other of Tobie, are out of the bookes that
1. Sam. 31. 30 are not Canonicall, and therfore can proue nothing. Third-
2. Sam. 1. 12 ly, the inhabitants of Iabes Gilead fasted when Saul was dead seuen dayes, and Dauid mourned and fasted for Saul and Ionathan. It may bee thought (saieth master Bellarmine) although they seemed to doe it in token of heauinesse, yet that they did it especially to helpe the soules departed. So here wee must take master Bellarmines,
2. Sam. 12. 17 it may be thought, as a proofe for purgatorie. But howe he will prooue it, out of Dauids fasting and prayer for his child while it was aliue, I can not see, & he cannot well tell vs. But whereas maister Bellarmine, most falsely, without all warrant affirmeth, that this was the cause why the Patriarches so carefully desired buriall in the land of promise, as Iacob and Ioseph did, that they might bee parta-
Gene. 47. 30 Gene. 50. 25 kers of the prayers there made, and the sacrifices there of-
In Gene. Hom. 65. fered, Chrysostome telleth vs it was for another cause, namely to assure their posteritie, that the promised land at the length should be theirs. And this hee confirmeth by
Gene. 50. 25 Scripture, euen by Ioseph his wordes: Surely God will visite you, and you shall carie my bones hence.
Psal. 38. 1. Fourthly, O Lord rebuke me not in thine anger, neither chasten me in thy wrath. Where is purgatory here? Chastice me not in thy wrath, that is, Let me not be in purgatorie. No authoritie of man, no credit of person can make this a good proofe. His fift place, Wee went through fire
Psal. 66. 12. and water, & thou brought est vs into this wealth. sheweth how God had dealt with his people here, but what is

this

this to purgatorie, which is else where: or what is this to proue our state that must be hereafter? Sirrly, The Lord shal wash the filthines of the daughters of Sion, &c. with the spirit of burning. Now this burning must needs be in purgatorie fire, master Bellarmine thinketh, otherwise here is no proofe for purgatorie. But S. Hierom expoundeth it by that place of Matthew, He shall baptise with the holy Ghost, and with fire. The seuenth, Wickednes burneth as fire: it deuoureth the briers and thornes. What is there no torment of shame, or for sinne here, none else where but that purgatorie must needes be proued out of this? Let the indifferent reader iudge of it. The eight place, Reioyce not against me, O mine enemie, though I fall, I shal rise, when I shal sit in darknesse, the Lord shall be my light, I will bear the wrath of the Lord, because I haue sinned against him. Saint Ierom expoundeth these wordes to be the wordes of Ierusalem to Babilon, that the Babylonians should not reioyce at their captiuitie. What proofe is this for purgatorie? Perchance they were in purgatorie in Babylon, that was not this popish purgatorie, which they would picke out of it. Ninthly, he will proue it by that lake that Zacharie speaketh of, Wherein is no water. Where the prophet speaketh of their deliuerance out of Babylon. But if we will haue it expounded figuratiuely, S. Hierom vnderstandeth of that lake wherein the rich man was, and that was a place out of which he could not come. Lastly, the place in Malachie, is to this effect, that he will sanctifie the priests, that they may offer holy offerings. What? And shall they come out of purgatorie to offer sacrifices? If not, he might haue spared this place, as also all the rest. For there is not one that hath any shew of proofe of that, for which they are brought. Surely, fit for these proofes, were that conclusion which I remember a preacher in Queene Maries time made in a funerall sermon. *Nec est qui se abscondat a calore eius*, Neither can any man escape purgatorie. And was not this clearkely handled? The prophet

Esa. 4. 4.

Iero. in Esa. 4 Matth. 3.

Esa. 9. 18.

Mich. 7. 8.

Li. 2. in Mic. 7

Zach. 9. 11.

Malac. 3. 3.

Psal. 19. 6.

phet speaketh of the sunn whose heat none can hide themselues from, and he perchance in a dreame or some vision, learned to expound it of purgatorie. But here I must admonish the reader, that in most of these places alledged. M. Bellarmine bringeth perchance some one in, or some mo of the fathers so expounding the same: but therin he playeth but the part of Cham, who hid not, but proclamed the nakednesse of his father. It had beene his part rather, to haue buried in silence, those their senseleſſe and singular interpretations. But now let vs see what he bringeth out of the newe Testament? Whosoeuer shall speake against the holy Ghost, it shall not bee forgiuen him, neither in this worlde, nor in the worlde to come: therefore, say they, some mens sinnes bee remitted in the worlde to come. But Saint Marke comming after saint Matthew expoundeth his wordes, Hee shall neuer haue forgiuenesse, but is culpable of eternal damnation. A direct answere to their obiection. Secondarily, they obiect out of saint Paul, Himselfe shalbe safe, yet as it were by the fire. Out of saint August. M. Bellar. confesseth this place to be hard, and in deed is diuersly expounded, by reason of the hardnesse of it: and therefore, out of an vncertaine place, he cannot gather a certaine argument. But of purgatorie it cannot be meant, because he maketh this fire a triall of euery mans worke, as saint Augustine wel noteth. And though themselues shall bee saued, yet is it as it were by fire. But I trust they will neuer thrust saint Peter and the other apostles into purgatorie. Yea, they teach that some come not there. Therefore this fire whereby Euerie mans worke is tried, cannot bee purgatorie. Saint Augustine in the place named, thinketh it to bee tribulation. Saint Ambrose seemeth to expound it of the confusion of minde. But of purgatorie, I haue shewed it cannot be meant. His third proofe is far fetched, euen beyond all compasse of reason, What shall they doe that are baptised for dead? that is, (saith maister Bellarmine) what shall they do that pray, fast,

Gene. 9. 22. De purg. li. 1. cap. 4. Mat. 12. 32. Mark. 3. 29. 1. Cor. 3. 15 De ciuit. dei. li. 21. cap. 26. Ambrose vpon this place. 1. Cor. 15. 29

fast, mourne, and afflict themselues for the dead. So that to pray, fast, or lament, if wee will beleeue master Bellarmine, is to be baptised. Hath hee not wrung hard, thinke you, to wring such a meaning out of these words? To poynt vnto his folly, I trust, is sufficient confutation of it. Mat.5.26.

Fourthly, Thou shalt not come out thence, vntill thou haue paid the vttermost farthing, therefore it must bee payd, say they. First in the words, there is no such necessitie. Ioseph knew not Marie, vntill she had brought forth her first begotten sonne, that is, as they will confesse, neuer. So we say, in that place, thou shalt neuer come out thence. Secondly, the place is wholy parabolical, & therfore out of such speaches, infallible arguments cannot be gathered, Thirdly saint Augustine by this prison meaneth hell, from whence the sinner shall neuer come. Now what is this to purgatorie? The fift place alledged by master Bellarmine, is out of the same chapter, Whosoeuer is angrie with his brother, &c. Here master Bellarmine gathereth out of S. August. that all these punishments belong to the life to come. Then also that there are three sorts of sinnes. He might also haue told vs out of S. Augu. that in Gods iudgement, anger that is the least of these sinnes, deserueth hell. But that maketh against purgatory, and therefore he would not see it. And it is most certaine, that our sauiour Christ there teacheth vs, that ỳ cõmandement, Thou shalt not kill, is sundry waies broken: Neither can out of these words be gathered, that there must be satisfaction after this life, which Bellar. would proue. Moreouer he reasoneth out of S. Luke. Make you friends of riches of iniquitie, that when you shall want, they may receiue you into euerlasting habitations. If by friends in this place we should vnderstand the saints, yet it maketh not for purgatory, as may appeare. For in this argumẽt there can be no necessarie cõsequence. The saints must receiue vs into heauen: therfore we must go by purgatory: but the saints cãnot neither must they haue that honor giuẽ to thẽ, that they shuld receiue vs into

De salut. docu. cap. 64

Mat.5.22.

De ser. dom. in mont. li.1.

Luke 16.9.

Mat. 25. 34. into the euerlasting habitations: it is Christ that must say Come ye blessed: He must giue that inheritance, that hath bought it with his pretious bloud: or else a man may giue it vnto the wicked, that shall neuer come there, or to such as out liue him, neither of which can bee there to receiue him. By al which reasons it appeareth, that in those words our sauior Christ doth but allude vnto such as whilest they haue ability, doe make others their friends. So would hee haue vs whom God hath made his stewards, with well vsing of our riches to please God, that hee also of his gratiLuk. 23. 42. ous goodnes may shew mercy to vs. Seuẽthly, Remember me when thou comest into thy kingdome, saide the thiefe that was put to death with Christ, therefore saieth maister Bellarmine, he thought that sinnes might be after this life remitted. So that this is his meaning, as the papistes would perswade vs: remember me, that is, let me be Vers. 43. praied for when I am dead. But they doe not remember how Christ promised he should not come in purgatory, but be with him euen that day in Paradise. His eight place, Act. 2. 24. He loosed the sorrows of death (so it is in greeke, but M. Bellarmine that hee might get an argument out of that place, woulde haue vs reade the sorrowes of hell.) It is not worth answering, because hee must alter the wordes, or els he must haue one argument fewer than hee looked for. His last place himselfe misliketh, and thinketh it not to proue any thing for them, and therefore I will not speake of it. Now for their argumentes out of the fathers, hee that will but indifferentlie consider of them shall finde the fathers to be in this point verie vncertaine. And the question being amongst vs, whether purgatory bee a catholicke doctrine, wee haue not to regard what they in their priuate and doubtful opinions doe set downe, but what with one consent and constantly they teach. Seeing therefore that neither the fathers with one consent teach it, neither themselues knowe well what to saie of it, as in many places of maister Bellarmine his two bookes of purgatory may appeare

peare: I will conclude with that golden saying taken out of Gelasius a pope. We reade that Christ raised the dead, but that hee absolued such as died in error wee doe not reade. And afterwardes speaking of the authority of binding and loosing, giuen in those words, Whatsoeuer thou shalt loose vpon earth, shall bee loosed in heauen, and whatsoeuer thou shalt binde vpon earth, &c. Gelasius thus inferreth, In earth saith he: for he that is dead being bound, he said not that he should be absolued, or loosed. Caus. 24. Q. 2. ca. legim. Matth. 16. 19.

An abridgement of Vincentius Lirinensis: with some obseruations vpon the saide Author.

Chap. 32.

NOw in steede of a conclusion vnto this treatise of controuersies, I haue thought good to draw into a briefe summe that booke of Vincentius Lyrinensis against heresies, which is so much alleadged against vs. Whom because they so confidently produce against vs in defence of their cause, I take his authority to be so much the stronger against them, that euen by the iudgement of their owne witnes (for so they recken him) they may bee conuinced of newnesse and falshood in their doctrine, and of vntruth in challenging to their errours the name of catholicke faith, and to themselues of catholicke men or women. But before I come to the treatise it selfe, that we may the better vnderstand vpon what occasion he so greatly accounteth of the ancient tradition of holy men, for the interpretation of the scriptures: first wee must perswade our selues, that this learned father coulde not bee ignorant of that way to finde out the true meaning of the scriptures, which the godly

ly fathers a little before his time han set downe, namely by conferring one place with another, and by waying the circumstances of the place it selfe. As S. Hillary de trin. li. 1. Ambr. in Psal. 118. Serm. 8. Hierom vpon Esay. 19. 1. Basil in reg. breu. quæst. 267. Chrysostome vpon Gen. hom. 12. And saint Augustine in many places haue plainly taught. Neither yet must we imagine, that Vincentius contrary to that which himselfe teacheth throughout this whole booke, would that this his rule shoulde bee accounted the onlie way to finde out the trueth of Gods worde, and that which so many before him with such a ful consent haue taught vs shoulde bee reiected. Therefore it is certaine that his meaning is, to such godly waies as others before him haue vsed for trial of the truth, to adde this also as a rule that may bee profitable, and doe much good, if it bee vsed wisely, and truly considered of. And the rather did hee teach vs this way, because the Pelagians so boldly and confidently preferred their newe doctrine before the ancient faith, whereof this authour complaineth fol. 15. And Nestorius condemned all that were before him as if they knew nothing in comparison of himselfe, as wee maie see fol. 54. For this cause Vincentius teacheth vs in this his booke which hee therefore calleth *Commonitorium*, an admonition or caueat to auoid the new deuises of priuate men, and to holde fast the ancient faith of the vniuersal church. And yet although Vincentius Lyrinensis did then see, that that which was then catholicke and auncient it was also true, and therefore that then it was a good rule to trie doctrines by: yet the argument of the Church of Rome is too too foolish when thus they reason. This religion is olde, and hath had approbation of the greatest number for some hundredes of yeares: therefore it is good. For Vincentius did looke into that faith that was then ancient and catholicke, many hundred yeares before many articles of popish religion were hatched. But the papistes thinke it enough for them,

if

if they can proue their religion to bee nowe olde. Whereas in truyeth, and according to Vincentius his rule also, that which was not then olde, is not now good. That which was not then catholicke, is nowe of all good men to bee reiected. But let vs see what Vincentius saith.

After that hee hath declared, how that by opportunity of time and place hee was mooued to write: hee sheweth that to finde out the falshoode of heresies there are two waies. The one by the authoritie of Gods word, Whose rule is perfect, and of it selfe sufficeth for all thinges aboundantly: Yet because it is diuersly expounded (such is the depth thereof) as by example of sundry heresies doeth appeare: The seconde way to finde out heresies hee maketh this: By the tradition and rule of the catholicke Church to interpret that which is set downe, in the writings of the Prophetes and apostles. But so as wee take heede, that wee receiue not for Catholicke, euery thing that is holden in the Catholicke Church: but that onely that is beleeued in all places, and so hath vniuersality, at all times, and so hath antiquity, of all or almost all the godly and learned, and so hath consent. So that a Catholicke Christian must more regarde the soundnesse of the whole body, than a parte thereof that is corrupted.

Gods word sufficient.

Catholicke

And where the infection is generall, that which hath beene taught of olde, is to bee preferred before the new. But before the auncient errour of two or three, or of one citty or cuntry, a man must preferre that which vniuersally, the vniuersall Church hath decreede, if anie such bee. If not, then hee must consider of the iudgementes of the sincerest fathers, not of a fewe of them, but of all, What they haue holden, written, taught, with one consent, plainely, often, not changing their minde, that hee may boldely beleeue. So did the godly fathers in Affrica, against Donatus, and also others against that heresie of the Arrians that had infected almost

When the fathers are to be beleeued.

all

al christendome, and caused great destruction and cruelty, because there were brought in superstitions inuented by men in steede of the Heauenly doctrine, as is proued out of saint Ambrose, and newe deuises for ancient decrees. Yea so they withstoode all heresies, whilest in the verie antiquity of the church they defended that only that was also vniuersal, that is to say, Ancient Vniuersality. And the more deuout that men were, the more stiffy did they oppose themselues to new inuentions. As for example, Stephen bishop of Rome with his associates, did set themselues against the new opinion of Agrippinus bishop of Carthage, yea and against the councell of Carthage. For hee knewe that nothing can in account be godly, Vnlesse all thinges were sealed vp to the children as faithfully, as the fathers receiued them. And that we must not leade religion, which way we will, but followe her which way shee wil go. And that it be seemeth not christian modestie or grauitie, to deliuer to their posterity any thing of their owne, but to preserue that which is receiued from the fathers. And by occasion of the Donatistes, who vnder colour of the decrees of the councell of Carthage, saide that they baptised againe such as were baptised by heretickes, hee teacheth that some deceiuers going about in some other bodies names, to set forth their owne heresie, Doe snatch some of the writings of the ancient fathers, such lightly as are most obscurely written, which for their obscuritie, maie after a sort agree with that they teach, to this ende that whatsoeuer they say, they may be thought, neither first, nor onlie to saie it. Whose fault is double, both in that they broach heresies, and also open that in the fathers which shoulde bee hidden, as did Cham: whose rewarde vpon him and his posterity should feare them. But to alter the faith, or corrupt religion, men should be afraid, not only in respect of ecclesiasticall discipline, but also in regard of the censure of the apostle against such. Gal. 1. 6. 7. 2. Tim. 4. 3. 1. Tim. 5. 12. Rom. 16 17.

Ancient vniuersalitie.

We must follow religion and not lead her.

A liuely description of popish teaching.

2. Tim.

2.Tim.3.6,7. Tit.1.16. 1.Tim.3.1. 1.Tim.6.4,5. 1.Tim.5.13. 1.Tim.1.19. 1.Tim.2.16,17. 2.Tim.3.9. And because there came amongst the Galathians such as carried about errours and set them on sale, whom the Galathians hearing, did loathe the trueth, vomiting the Manna of Apostolike and catholike doctrine, liking well of the filth of nouelties, the apostle denounceth that they should not heare either the apostles or an angell from heauen if he should preach any thing besides that hee had preached Gal.1.8,9. And this caueat belongeth not to the Galathians only, no more than the other precepts of godly life, so that it hath not beene, is, or shall be lawfull, for catholike christians to teach any thing besides that that they haue receiued. And to hold accursed al those, who preach any thing else, than that which is Once receiued, it alwayes hath beene, is, and shall be our duetie: So that to preach any thing else is too much boldenesse: and to heare any thing else is too much lightnesse. Althogh some frogges, midges, and flies, of a short time, such as the Pelagians crie against it, seeking to drawe vs from that, which hath beene committed vnto vs by our fathers: and notable persons are thus many times infected, because God will by them proue whether men loue God vnfainedly or not, Deuteronomie 13.3. But this is a dangerous tentation, and may deceiue many, as by Nestorius, Photinus, and Apollinaris may appeare: whose heresies he describeth, as also the catholike doctrine, with some confutation of Arrianisme, and Manicheisme, and the other forenamed heresies. Against which danger of being by such men deceiued, he would haue vs to holde this propertie of true catholikes, with the Church to receiue the Doctours, but not with the Doctours to forsake the faith of the Church.

Such are our Seminary prists, who for their owne benefit in danger many, not men only, but euen countries.

Take heed of beleuing vnwritten traditions.

Why the learned are heretikes.

How farre the fathers are to be heard.

Then hauing shewed the daunger, that the great learning of Origen and Tertullian brought vnto the Church when they erred, hee repeateth triall, to bee cause of here-

A true catholike.

ſies many times, and then gathereth, Him to bee a true catholike who loueth Gods truth, the church, the bodie of Christ, who esteemeth nothing more than Gods religion, than the catholike faith, Not the authoritie of any man, not the loue that he beareth him, not his wit, eloquence or philoſophie. But deſpiſing all theſe, ſtedfaſt, and ſetled in faith, doeth make reckoning, that hee muſt hold and beleeue onely, whatſoeuer he knoweth the catholike church of olde beleeued. Hee confirmeth alſo that hereſies are for the triall of the godly by S. Paul 1. Cor. 11. 19. with a long and liuely deſcription, of ſuch as are wauering and doubtfull in faith, maruelling much at their madnes, that content not themſelues with the rule of faith, which of old once hath beene receiued, but day by day ſeeke new things, and delight alwayes to put ſomething to, or to change, or to take ſomewhat from religion. Not remembring that it is a heauenly doctrine which once to be reuealed ſufficeth, but as if it were an earthly inſtitution, which cannot be perfected, but by continuall mending or rather controlling it. This chopping & chāging in religion, he proueth to be dangerous by three other teſtimonies of ſcripture, Prouer. 22. 28. Eccl. 8, 17. Eccle. 10. 8. but eſpecially inſiſteth vpon that of Saint Paul 1. Tim. 6. 20. O Timothe, keep that which is committed vnto thee, and auoide prophane and vaine babling, and oppoſition of knowledge falſly ſo called. And ſheweth what is meant by this word *depoſitum*. That which is committed: that is, that which thou art truſted with, not that thou deuiſedſt: that thou haſt receiued, not inuented: a matter not of thine owne wit, but of an others teaching: not for thy priuate vſe, but for to deliuer to all. A thing brought to thee, not brought forth by thee: wherein thou maieſt bee, not the Author, but the keeper: not the teacher, but the ſcholler: not the leader, but the follower. This, as pure gold muſt be kept pure without corruption. It muſt be beautified and fitted,

The Papiſts are poſſeſſed with this mad ſpirit.

What is meant by That which is commited to thee.

but

but in any wise we must So teach that wee haue learned, that when we speake after a new manner, yet we bring no new matter. Yet we must grow, and the faster the better. So that it bee but growing and not changing. In the very same doctrine, the same meaning, the same vnderstanding. Euen as children grow in their body, but are the same that they were. But if any partes or members should be added, or turned into another shape, it were a monstrous thing. Such and no other must be our growing in religion, to no other, but to more perfection in the same. which hee also maketh manifest by the example of wheat, Which being sowen by our fathers in the primitiue church, must bee husbanded and dressed by vs, but the seede must not bee changed. Yea in these plantes of religion, we maie, nay wee must vse all diligence to trimme them and dresse them, but to change them, to mangle or maime them, it is great wickednesse. Yea they must still keepe their Fulnesse, sincerity, and property. For doe but once giue libertie to this deceit (of cutting or corrupting the Scriptures) and religion is in danger to bee quite ouerthrowen. If some maie bee cut off, nought will be left, if some maie bee mingled, nought will bee pure and sincere. But the Church of Christ is a carefull and warie keeper of doctrines lefte vnto her, shee neuer changeth any thing, diminisheth it not, addeth nothing. Shee cutteth not of thinges necessarie. Shee putteth not to thinges needelesse. Shee doeth not leese her owne, shee will haue nothing that belongeth to others. Yea and in all her Councels the church did nothing else, but set downe that in writing, which before was knowen onlie by tradition, and vtter by newe termes, matters of faith not new. We must also by all meanes possible shun and auoid such as bring not the catholicke and vniuersal doctrine, which hath continued one and the same from age to age, by one vndefiled tradition of the truth, and shal continue for euer without end.

Wee must teach no new thing. Growing in faith but no changing.

He seemeth to haue prophecies of the mischieses of popery.

The true church keepeth safely her owne.

The councels taught nothing in faith new. Teachers of newes must bee auoided.

And this newnesse of wordes the Apostle calleth prophane, because it hath in it nothing holy, nothing religious. These prophane nouelties therefore we must auoide: for, to receiue them is the maner, not of catholikes, but of heretikes. [What heresie hath beene at any time, but it hath beene vnder some certain name, in some certayne place, at some certaine time?] And no man doeth maintaine any heresie, but that hee first separateth him selfe from the consent of the vniuersality, and antiquitie of the catholike church. As hee prooueth by the examples of Pelagius, Celestius, Arrius, Sabellicus, Nouatianus, Simon Magus, Priscilianus, Yea, but Heretikes doe alleadge Scripture for al in a maner that they say, and therefore are they the more dangerous. And that practise did Sathan vse before against our sauiour Christ. But how then shall catholike men know how to iudge betweene truth and falshode in the holie Scriptures? euen by interpreting the same according to the traditions of the vniuersall church, and the rules of the catholike doctrine, and the consent that hath beene at all times, and in all places amongst the teachers.

The words thus [ ] included, I was loath to leaue out, because the Papists bragge much of them, as though they did mightily conuince vs to be heretikes. And yet if a man do well consider of them, hee may iustly doubt whether they be Vincentius his words, or added since, because they are brought in so impertinently to his matter, and nothing in all the booke either afore or after that soundeth that way. But, admit that they are his words, it is no hard matter to prooue this, in very many of the doctrines of the church of Rome, because therein they do iumpe and drawe in one yoke with the olde heretikes, of whome the stories mention, by whome, how, and when they beganne. But they will tell vs their doctrines were not condemned by any councel, which they professe. And how could they, when they that taught them had gotten the soueraignty ouer princes and prelats? Yea, he whom they call the catholike king, as in some respects they may truely, not because he loueth catholike religion. (For in a man of so excessiue greedinesse, intollerable pride, and vnnaturall cruelties, as many of his practises and purposes shew him to be, what religion can there be?) but because hee scarcely can content himselfe with the whole world, this man (I say) vsurpeth Nauarre, and intrudeth himselfe into the kingdome of Portingal. And yet so long as he ruleth them, their parleaments or councels dare not, no, they can not proclame him to be an vsurper or an intruder into other mens right, although hee is so: neither would our sauiour Christ haue regarded any thing this defence, that the Scribes and Pharises and Priests of the Iewes might haue vsed. In what councel was that condemned that we teach? but on the contrary he telleth that by their power and authoritie, they shut vp the kingdome of heauen before men, and suffer not them that would enter, Math. 23. 13. And so did the Church of Rome.

Interpreting scripture.

And

And yet not euery question must be thus decided, but only matters of faith, such as the very foundation of catholike doctrine resteth vpon (for so he saith after fol. 50.) neither are al heresies thus to be confuted, and at al times, but only new heresies, euen at their first beginning, Before they haue falsified the rules of the ancient faith, and the writings of the fathers. But old heresies which haue had long time to steale away the truth must be cōuinced if need be, by the only authority of scripture, or must be shūned, as being condēned in the old councels. As for heresies newly sprung vp, they, by the iudgements of the fathers are to be reiected, of those fathers (I say) that continued in the faith: so that al, or most of them, haue set it down, in one and the self same meaning, plainly, & often, continuing in it, as it were in a councell of such masters, agreeing in one. And such a ful consent must not be despised. Then he maketh a recapitulation of that which he hath said in these two caueats, and induceth the example of the councel of Ephesus, wherein the iudgement of the ancient fathers being examined, Nestorius was found to be against the catholike old faith, and Cyril to agree with holy antiquitie. And to make the matter more plaine, he setteth downe the names of those holy fathers, by whose vniforme consent and iudgement, both the testimonies of Gods lawe were expounded, and also the rule of the holy doctrine was established. And so reckoneth vp sundry of the Greeke church, then also of the Latine and west churches: wherein he maketh mention of certaine leters written vnto some from Fœlix and Iulius two bishops of Rome. And, that not only [The head of the worlde:] but the sides also might yeelde their testimonie to that iudgement, Cy-

Cite [illegible] to be [illegible] sed only [illegible] the greatest matters.

And [illegible] sprung vp heresies.

Stealing the truth, inchoatiues are the papistes, and their corrupting the fathers proueth.

When the fathers must be heard.

Bellarm. de Roman. pontif. lib. 2. cap. 16. endeuoureth by this testimonie to proone the Pope to be head of the church. But consider (I pray you) how negligently he performeth it. Vincentius saith that the city of Rome was the head of the world: And we confesse whilest the empire flourished it was so called, as by the stories appeareth. Now he proueth by this that the pope is head of the church, by a strange Metamorphosis changing the citie into the Pope, and the world into the church, contrary to the Author his words or meaning.

prian and Ambrose consenten therunto. And lastly he confirmeth this by the iudgment of Capreolus bishop of Carthage, who endeuoured to ouerthrow newnes, and to defend antiquitie. Which was also approued by Cyrils testimonie, who would haue the doctrines of the ancient faith confirmed, and that which is new, and superfluously inuented, and wickedly published, to be reiected, and condemned, wherunto the whole counceil agreed. And though there were many in that Councell, men of singular great learning, & in such sort gathered togither (which might haue imboldned thē to decree somwhat of their owne) yet would they alter nothing, but tooke all heede possible, that they deliuered nothing to their posteritie, but that they had receiued of their predecessours, leauing also to them that example. He inueigheth against the pride of Nestorius in defence of antiquitie, alledging that of Xistus bishop of Rome, Let not newnesse doe any thing, because it is not fit any thing should bee added vnto antiquitie. And that of Cælestinus, who would not haue Newnesse to trouble antiquitie. Whose meaning is not that antiquitie should cease to ouerthrow newnesse, but that newnesse should cease to molest antiquitie. Which thing whosoeuer will not yeeld vnto, he must despise the authoritie of Celestinus, Xistus, Cyril, Capreolus, the councell of Ephesus, who all had learned of God to decree, that not any thing should bee deliuered to their posteritie, but that onely, that sacred antiquitie of the holie fathers, and agreeing with it selfe in Christ did holde: yea not to yeeld vnto this, is to iustifie Nestorius by them condemned, and to despise the whole Church of Christ, and the teachers therein the Apostles and Prophets, but especially the Apostle saint Paul. The Church of Christ, I say, that neuer yet departed from a religious reuerencing and adorning of the faith deliuered to her, by saint Paul, who said, O Timothie, keepe that which was committed to thee, auoyding newnesse of wordes. And, If anie

New doctrine condemned.

The councell of Ephesus hath decided the new doctrine.

Ancient faith, the onely good faith.

The praise of the church to keepe the faith deliuered to her, not to inuent a new.

preach

preach to you any other thing, than that you haue heard, let him be accursed. And if neither the lawes of the apostles, nor decrees of the church are to be broken, according to which heretikes are worthily condemned: it behoueth all men, that will bee accounted the true children of their mother the church, to sticke euen to the death, vnto the sacred faith of their holy fathers, and to hate that that is newe. True children of the church.

Thus haue I set downe, I trust, truly and faithfully, the summe of this whole treatise of Vincentius Lyrinensis, especially whatsouer may be thought pertinent to the matter for which the Papists so triumphingly alledge him. And as I endeuoured to be short, yet so that I omit not any materiall poynt by him touched, so that his meaning may the better appeare, I haue (as neare as I could) kept his owne wordes: yea, I haue set downe euen his most materiall sentences, that his whole minde and intent, may the better bee knowne vnto the Reader. Iudge nowe, I pray thee, Christian Reader, what Catholike and auncient faith it is that the Church of Rome so much braggeth of. Compare it with this that Vincentius commendeth. If they bee any thing like, I desire no credite. I will but giue thee a taste hereof, euen out of one of their chiefe poyntes of their Religion. I haue shewed before e. Cap. 2. uen by their owne confession, that traditions must needes bee admitted, or else the Church of Rome must needes faile in proofe in many articles of their Religion. Their Religion therefore in such poynts cannot be Catholike. It cannot be that which was Committed to Timothie, which was Once deliuered, as Vincentius speaketh often: whose growing is without change, whose perfection is without addition, so that their doctrine of traditions, is a strong argument to proue that their faith is not Catholike, according to Vincentius rules. Then also we see how plainly he defineth, that old heresies must not bee confuted

by such argumentes, but onely such as are newly sprung vp. And yet the Papists, whose religion is almost nothing, but a sinke of such old and vnsauourie heresies, crie still to be tried by their vniuersalitie, and antiquitie, and the iudgements of men, flat contrarie to Vincentius his rules. And this triall he will not haue to be vsed but in great questions of fayth, but they make it a proofe for their most foolish toyes. So that although they readily call him in, because hee nameth Antiquitie, vniuersalitie and consent, vnto the which they woulde faine seeme to make claime, yet they will (I trust) from henceforth rather stoppe his mouth, than suffer him to speake, because his witnesse is their ouerthrowe. Let vs therefore keepe that faythfully, which is once deliuered vnto vs, which to chaunge, is to marre it: to put to it, or take from it, is to corrupt it, Let vs holde (I say) that fayth which is alwayes olde, and alwayes one, knowing that whatsoeuer we holde besides it, it is not newe onely, but euen starke naught also:

An exhortation to Christian Magistrates, for to defend this truth.

Chap. 33.

Thus hitherto haue I stood in defence of christian truth against popish falsehood, indeuouring according to my simple talent and slender skill, not only to admonish you of the baggage drosse which they bring vnto vs in steed of fine gold, what filthie water they would haue vs to drinke for pure wine: but also in the ballance of truth, to trie what stuffe it is, wherewith they seeke to corrupt the same vnto vs. And although the due acknowledging of mine own manifold wants & weaknesse, did discourage me a long time to enter into these lists; yet the rednesse that I see in manie

to

to take hold of the shadow of truth, neglecting in the meane time the bodie of the same: and on the other side the simplicitie of others, to discerne betweene light and darkenes, good and euill: to stay the first, and to helpe the latter sort, I haue thought good at one view, to set before thine eyes (gentle reader) that truth that we teach, that thou mayest know howe they haue slaundered it: and that falshoode which they maintaine, with some touch of their chiefe arguments, that thine owne selfe although ignorant and unlearned, may haue some triall of their corrupt doctrines. Nowe the especiall cause that moued me to take vpon mee this enterprise (God is my witnesse) is that dutie that I, and such as I am doe owe to the defence of the trueth by worde, or writing, or any such meanes, whereby wee are bound to occupie vntill our Lord and master come, the talent that he hath committed vnto vs, to his most gaine and glorie. Neither can I satisfie my self, that I haue thoughly performed my dutie, when I haue set downe what is truth, and what is falsehoode: vnlesse I indeuour also to stirre vp all Christian magistrates to the defence thereof, to their vttermost power, in singlenesse of heart: whom for that cause God hath set in high roomes, and to whom God hath committed that great charge, and at whose hands hee shall call for a strait account for that dutie. Be wise therefore now, O kings, be learned ye that are Iudges of the earth: Serue the Lord in feare, and reioyce in trembling. Kisse the sonne least he be angrie. And if you will knowe how princes may, nay, howe princes must serue the Lord in feare, Saint Augustine teacheth it: In forbidding and punishing with religious seueritie, those things which are done against Gods commandment. So that this seruice of the Lord consisteth of two points. First in making of good lawes, for the maintenance of the truth, and abolishing of idolatrie. Secondly in punishing such as offend against the same, with a religious seuerity. This then is the first thing that is required in all godly Magistrates, euen

Ps. 16. 11. 12

Epist. 50.

from

from the prince that sitteth vpon the throne, vnto the meanest that beareth office in the common wealth, but especially of the that haue the soueraigne authoritie, that they haue a watchfull eie, and a continuall care, to consider and finde out what things they are, whereby either the glory of God is most hindred, and his seruice prophaned, or sin is within their common wealthes or seuerall charges occasioned and maintained. Which when they espie, they must seeke by godly lawes, and ordinances, to prouide some speedie remedie for the same. For when I affirme, that princes & magistrates must make decrees for the truth against idolatrie and superstition, my meaning is not to enter into that question against the papists, whether ciuill magistrates may meddle with matters of religion or not (although euen the truth therof also, by the way may appeare) but because I speake to such as acknowledge and confesse this to be their dutie and haue giuen notable testimonie of their perswasion therein: my desire and indeuour is to stir them vp, that neither they will be vnmindful thereof, but alwaies and earnestly thinke of it, neither vnwilling thereto, but readily and diligently performe it. For this cause God calleth princes sometime sheepheards, (so was Cyrus, to teach them that they ought to be as watchfull and painful for the good of their people, as is the sheepheard for the good of his flocke: yea they must be watchemen ouer their people, and take great heed that through their fault the people perish not: for if they doe, it will also turne to their owne destruction. For as saint Augustine saieth Their negligence shall slay them. Their negligence, I say, whereby they are slacke in performing their dutie. They are also called heads ouer their people, not onely because they should haue eies alwaies to prie and spie (for the eies are in the head) what danger may fall vpon the people, and find meanes to auoid it: but also because they should in all carefull and christian discretion, guide and direct them that are vnder them. And because it is true that saint Paul saith, He is the minister

Esa. 44. 28.

Ezek. 34. 2. &c.

De pastoribus. cap. 9.

Rom. 13. 4.

of

of God for the wealth of the peole, and that he beareth not the sworde for nought, but for to take vengeance of them that doe euill: It is most necessaris that he prouide such lawes as may tend to those endes, and set downe such decrees as may bridle disobedient & vngodly persons, that they who faine would, may the more quietly liue in honestie and godlines. 1.Tim.2.2. Such is that law or statute that Asa king of Iudah made, when he sawe how readie his people were to fall to Idolatrie and superstition, and had taken away the altars of the straunge gods, and broken downe their images and high places. He commaunded Iudah to seeke the Lord God of their fathers, and to do according to the law & the cõmandement. 2.Chro.14.3.4. Wherin it seemeth vnto me that their case and ours is verie like, therefore we cannot finde a fitter patterne to set before vs for redresse of our euils, than by such lawes as hee made. And seeing hee did this in the beginning of his reigne, he teacheth Magistrates a good lesson, that it beseemeth not princes or others to make anie delaie to serue the Lord, but to take all opportunities to doe it. For delay many times bringeth coldnesse, and coldnesse groweth to neglect of duetie. And so did Iehosaphat his sonne after him. 2.Chron.17.6.7. In whose storie appeareth a maruellous diligens care that hee had, to take away all occasion of Idolatrie from amongest his people. And also there appeareth, howe hee charged both the ciuill Magistrates that were vnder him, and the Priests also and Leuites, and had an eye to them that they slept it not. 2.Chro.19.4. Yea, and hee did not onelie set Leuites and Priests at Ierusalem, for the better performance of these things, but also Iudges citie by citie, in euery strong citie of Iudah. 2.Chro.19.8.5. For hee knewe that it was a daungerous thing for Magistrates to bee Non-resident, (for there are no Non-residents, than they that are comunly cried out against.) And for my part, the no that there are, the more, I think is the land defiled with sin. But Iehosaphat because he would haue þ magistrats alwais ready to attend Non-residents.

vpon

vpon their charge (as I also confesse it to bee the duty of ministers to attend vpon their charge) bee appointed them their cities, and made a progresse through the country, to see these thinges done. As also it is a notable good practise for godly Princes in their progresses to inquire of such defaultes as are in the country where they remaine. Yea I knowe not whether there bee now any other way so good, for reformation of such generall disorders as are amongest vs, as that the soueraigne authority will vse some way to looke into the doings of such as are vnder her in the church, and common wealth, and with speede reforme the same. I feare it would be found that from top to toe, there would almost be nothing sound, From the sole of the foote, to the crowne of the head nothing whole. For we are fallen into times wherein almost euery man seeketh his own, I say his owne will, profit, pleasure, estimation, without any great regarde of church or common wealth. But I would that were the worst. For alas we haue too many, & those great ones, who doe notably abuse their greatnesse and authority, to the vndoing of many other. Their hand is according to their power, as the Prophet saith, to doe as much hurt as they can: And their will must bee obeyed more carefully than any law. If they be not so shameleſſe that they will say, yet they thinke as the vngodly of whom the Prophet Dauid complaineth, That they contemne the Lord: that they are so proud that they seeke not for God. They thinke alwaies there is no God. And againe, With our tongue will wee preuaile, our lippes are our owne, who is Lord ouer vs. Now although he that sitteth in heauen shall laugh (at these their foolish thoughtes) and the Lord shall haue them in derision: yet must Princes (vnlesse they will neglect their dutie) haue a great care to reforme or remoone such vngodly persons: being wel assured that the highest powers must not only answere for their owne negligences, but also for the oppressions, wrongs, and negligences of such as they place vnder them: vnlesse they

Ier. 1. 6.

Mich. 2. 1.

Psal. 10. 3. 4.

Psal. 12. 4.

Psal. 2. 4.

they haue a due regarde to place in authoritie such as are worthiest, and also when they heare of their defaultes they seeke speedely to reforme the same. So that Princes haue high places, with a heauy charge, their honour is great, but greater is their burden, as appeareth by the first Chapter of the booke of Wisdome. Which Chapter I would wish all Princes to be well acquainted withall, that they would make it as it were their looking glasse wherein they would vse to looke daily. For if these thinges were well remembred, (as alas it is too easie a thing for the best of vs to forget our duties, and mighty ones, haue not only their soueraignety, which maketh them many times too proude, but also many flatterers to commend in them euen that which is euill) but I say if these thinges were well remembred, Princes in placing of Magistrates either in church or common wealth, would not so much be abused by them, who being corrupted by bribes, or mooued by fauour, or in some other worldly consideration, are content to commend such to be fit to gouerne others, as could neuer yet gouerne themselues well. Princes I say, that haue due consideration of their owne duty, and the strait account that they must giue if they doe it not, and that before that great and iust iudge, who will not be corrupted, nor cannot be deceiued, wil neuer commit their people to be gouerned by such bad guids, neither their duty to be done by such negligent or vnfit deputies. And heere would I most humbly craue of her most gracious Maiesty, that as it hath pleased God to aduaunce her grace aboue all other within her highnes dominions, so as shee tendereth the good of her people, the discharge of her duty, the defence of the church whereof shee hath her title, and the saluation of her owne soule, shee will continually begge of this our good God, by earnest and harty praier, not only that her selfe may carefully endeuour to serue the Lord: but also that hee will giue her the spirit of wisedome to take heed that she aduance not any within her Maiesties dominions to the rule of others, but such as her selfe

knoweth,

Exod.18.21. knoweth, or by good men is perfectly informed, that they are as moeede they ought to be, Men of courage, fearing God, dealing truly, and hating couetouſnes. And that ſhee will not thinke any fit for gouernment, either in religion or ciuill pollicy, but ſuch as will execute their office, In the
2.Chro.19.9 feare of the Lord, faithfully, and with a perfect hearte. Then ſhall ſhee according to the dutie of a Chriſtian Magiſtrate performe her office faithfully, maintaine the truth zealouſly, incourage the godly, diſcourage and daunt the heartes of the wicked, relieue the oppreſſed, reſourme the oppreſſours. So ſhall ſhee bring increaſe to the trueth, glorie to her gouernement, ſafety to her perſon,
Eſa.26.1, Pro.29.14. quietneſſe to her Realme. For, Saluation ſhall God ſet for walles and Bulworkes, And a King that iudgeth the poore in trueth, his throne is eſtabliſhed for euer. But on the contrary, if gouernement be ſtill committed to vngodly men, religion ſhall dwel in contempt, wickedneſſe ſhall abounde. Such as God hath not incouraged to doe good, although they woulde faine, yet ſhall
Prou.29.2. bee afraide to ſerue the Lorde. For, When the righteous are in authoritie the people reioyce, but when the wicked beare rule the people ſigh. Take heede I pray O yee Magiſtrates, that that reproach may not iuſtly bee laide vppon vs, that was ſpoken againſt the Iewes, who
Eſa. 1.23. were called Gods people before vs. Thy Princes are rebellious and companions of theeues, euerie one loueth gifites, and followeth after rewardes, they iudge not the fatherleſſe, neither doeth the widdowes cauſe come before them. For By ſwearing, and lying, and
Hoſ.4.2. killing, and ſtealing, and whoring, they breake out, and bloud toucheth bloud. But it is moſt certaine that ſinne breaketh out in euery corner in great aboundance by ſea, by lande: yea and if it bee not maintained by ſome, yet is it too much ſpared, and too little puniſhed almoſt by al men that haue authority. If ſuch diſorders may ſtil be permitted, that is, if offendours may ſtil goe vnpuniſhed,

and

and they that beare with and wincke at such thinges maie ſtil beare authority, can we looke for any other thing than that God ſhoulde ſaie vnto vs, as hee ſaide in his wrath vnto his owne people, whome hee loued as dearely as vs, Ariſe, depart (out of this land) this is not your reſt. Because it is polluted, it ſhall deſtroy you, euen with a ſore deſtruction. For God in Leuiticus pronounceth that a lande is ſo defiled with ſinne, that it muſt vomit out her inhabitantes. Haue we not then iuſt cauſe to feare Gods heauy wrath, ſeeing that idolatry, and ſuperſtition, blaſphemies, murders, whoredomes, robbings and ſtealings dae ſo abounde in many places of this lande, and yet ſo litle reformation, yea ſo much forbearing of ſuch bad perſons, yea of ſuch as are moſt notorious offendours, ſo much ſpeaking and writing for them, ſo much pitying them vpon their teares, ſo much reprouing them after their iudgement, that they might haue time and meanes to procure their pardon, as though wee feared nothing more, than that the weedes ſhould be weeded out, leaſt they ſhoulde hurt the herbes, or the tares plucked vp that they choke not vp the corne. This our wel liking of ſinne, this forbearing of ſo bad men is it, that I more feare, and will indeede ſooner bring this land to deſolation, than al the cruell practiſes of profeſſed enemies or faithles friends. This I ſay, if wee repent not, ſhal make vs weake, & our enemies ſtrong, this ſhal more haſtely bring vpon vs, and againſt vs the Spaniard, & more ſtrengthen his hand, than al that he can deuiſe, beare he neuer ſo cruel a hatred againſt vs. So that whoſoeuer or whatſoeuer they be, that wil not now, when by their authority they may, nay whē they ought to procure peace & ſafety vnto the oppreſſed, by puniſhing offendours, ſhal one day, if with ſpeed they amend it not, ſee that al things that belong to their peace ſhal be hidden from their eies. For there is no peace to the wicked. If any man thinke that I note any particular perſons herein, they are deceiued. I rather touch all. For I ſee ſuch horrible vices abounde

2 Chr. 2. 20.

Leuit. 18. 25.

Luc. 19. 42. Eſa. 48. 22.

al

almost in euery place, and such disobedience against God and man, and so little punishment especially of such as can procure the friendship of some great men, although their offences be great, that I say with the Prophet, Wickednes saith to the wicked man euen in my hart, that there is no feare of God before his eies. So that almost the continuall breach of all good lawes, by them that haue any delight to sinne, doth proclaime it in the eares of men more shrill then the sounde of a trumpet, that many of our Magistrates are farre shorte of that duty that they shoulde performe. Which as we feele in these north partes, to be the vndoing of many a poore man in particular, yea almost the ruinating of the country, so I heare the south parts are not in much better case: But whosoeuer is boldest to sinne, findeth many friendes to sue for his pardon. Which if it be true, let vs assure our selues, that our generall contempt of religion, and iustice, and that after so many warnings and so plaine, giuen by Gods messengers against this, shal bring vpon vs, and our land a general plague. Neither let vs flatter our selues in our owne strength, or our allyes, or that our enemies are weake or otherwise occupied. If we prouoke the Lord he shal neuer want whips to whip vs withal. And thus much by way of digression, vpon occasion of good Iehosaphats great care that hee had to examine and see, that they that beare office vnder him, did deale zealously for the truth, and iustly and truely, with his people. A godly care, a good but a rare example. Which point although Iehosaphats example gaue me good occasion to enter into, yet the necessity of these times doth the rather force mee to handle the same. Yea this is so necessarilie belonging to the matter that I am in hande withall, that neither godlie lawes and decrees, can easily bee deuised & published, neither being made can at all be executed, vnlesse this be chiefly regarded. But to returne to my matter againe. When Ahaz the king of Iudah had polluted the land with idolatries of sundry sortes, after him commeth

Ezechiah

Ezechiah his sonne, who opened the doores of the tem- 2.Chro.29.
ple that Ahaz had shut vp, hee called for the Priestes and commaunded them to sanctifie themselues, teaching them their duetie, hee gathered the Princes together to the house of the Lorde, hee commaunded the Priestes to offer, and hee and the Princes commaunded the Leuites to praise the Lorde: appointing how, namely, with the wordes of Dauid: yea, hee also by Postes 2.Chro.30.6
sent to all Iudah and Israel, that they shoulde come to 2.Chro.30.
keepe the Passeouer. And Iosiah his diligence to serue the Lorde, by commaunding to reforme such thinges as were amisse, is notable in his storie. In which example of Iosiah it is woorthie the marking, howe hee gathered togither all the Elders of Iudah and Ierusalem, and the people also, and made them goe vp with him vnto the Lordes house. And Ezechiah and hee (as in the storie of Ezechiah is noted) commanded them to come to celebrate the Passeouer. And in Ezechiah his dayes it is to their eternall praise set downe, that they had not one Rebellant, but God gaue them one heart to doe the comman- 2.Chro.30.12
dement of the king. If Princes might then make lawes to bring their people to the church, and constraine them to be partakers of their rites and seruice: why may not Princes now doe the like? May, if it were then the duetie of the Rulers amongst Gods people, to be carefull to make such lawes, howe can our Rulers excuse themselues, if they be found slacke herein? For (as before I haue shewed) I seeke not by these examples to shewe what Princes may do, but what they can not but doe, vnlesse they will runne in danger of Gods displeasure. But, to proceede in 2.Chr.34.18
the storie of Iosiah, when Hilkiah the priest had found the booke of the lawe, it was not reserued with the Priest, as though hee onely might meddle with religion, but it was carried by Saphan to the king, and the king comman- 16
ded Hilkiah the priest with others to goe to inquire of 20
the Lord for him, and for Iudah, to turne away Gods

wrath. In all which examples marke howe godlie kings haue had a very watchful regard alwaies, to giue commãdements and make lawes, to take away superstition, or negligence in comming to Gods seruice, and to further the true worship of God. To these I might adde a cloud of witnesses out of Ecclesiasticall histories, but in a matter so plaine I trust I neede not produce the particular examples of Emperours and Kings, as well else-where as in our owne land and country this realme of England, who haue made sundry lawes, giuen sundry commandements, vnto ecclesiasticall persons in matters of religion, whereby they haue declared, that if not their onely, yet their especiall care was, that God might be religiously serued, not of themselues onely, but of their people also. Now therefore it remaineth, that our godly Magistrates make profite of these good examples, not onely by learning what they may, but in knowing what they must doe. For as saint Augustine very well and profitably noteth, the kings that amongst Gods people did not forbid and ouerthrow whatsoeuer was contrary to gods precept, are reproued, & they that did forbid such thinges, are praised. Yea, that ancient father there commendeth to vs the examples of the kings of Niniue, who compelled the whole citie for to appease Gods wrath: And Darius, who commaunded the Idoll to be broken, and Daniels enemies to be cast vnto the lions: and of Nabuchadnezzar, who by a fearefull lawe prohibited the blaspheming of the true God. Out of all which wee may learne, not onely what the godly Princes did, but euen howe carefull they were to doe it: so that it doeth seeme to haue beene their continuall meditation and studie, howe they might remoue such stumbling blockes as did lie in their peoples wayes, whereby they might be hindred from seruing the Lord sincerely. For they knew it to be true, that Saint Augustine saieth, that the happinesse of kings doeth not consist in their long raigne, or succession of their children, in vanquishing their

Epist. ad Bonifacium 50.

Ion. 3.

Dan. 6.

Dan. 3.

De ciuit. Dei lib. 5. cap. 24

enemies,

enemies, or subduing their rebellious subiectes, but if they gouerne righteously, if they make their power serue to the furtherance of Gods seruice, if they bee slow to reuenge and ready to forgiue, but so as their reuenge bee for the necessary ruling and defending of the common wealth, and if their clemency bee not to haue sinne vnpunished, but the sinner reformed. Continue therefore (O gratious Soueraigne) that godly race which hitherto you haue most happely runne, for the maintenance of Gods trueth, and neuer be weary of well doing, but still as neede requireth, let precept be after precept, statute vpon statute, commaundement vpon commandement, law after lawe, so long as Idolatrie and superstition is not sufficiently abolished, so long as popish heresies are so readily imbraced, so long as so many ignorant men and foolish wemen, without regarde of duty to God or man, without any shew of reason, yea without due care of their owne soules, vnder pretence of conscience, doe against all conscience.

For with what conscience (I pray) may they preferre a forraine power, before the gouernement of their naturall Prince, or make the supremacy of the Pope a necessarie article of faith, which was neuer taught by Christ, his Apostles or the primitiue Church: nay neuer thought vpon, vntill the Bishoppe of Rome came to his excesse of pride of late yeares? Or by what colour of conscience can they despise Gods woorde, contemne his Sacramentes, and separate themselues so wilfully from that bodie that dareth not receiue any thing but that they are sure that Christ hath taught? Vntill such time I say, as such as professe the name of christianity within your dominions, may in external shewe be compelled to come vnto Christ, or at the least, not to dare openly to deny him and his trueth, godly Magistrates ought still to make their lawes more perfect, that they may haue a remedy for euery inconuenience.

And these lawes should be so strong, that they might holde as well the mightiest as the meanest, and not like the spiders cobweb, which can take onely the small, or weake flies, but can doe nothing to holde the strong ones. And that is it that Saint Augustine doeth meane, when Epist. 50. hee saieth, that Lawes shoulde bee made with conuenient strength: For, if Poperie and Idolatrie bee euill in one, it is not tollerable in any. And if some may without danger of punishment breake lawes, or haue exemptions to transgresse the same, it much emboldeneth other to doe the like. And howe in pollicie wise men can iudge it to be conuenient I knowe not, but in christianitie I can not see howe it may be tollerable, that in a land, where the light of the Gospell shineth, Popery may bee any thing tollerated to any without any punishment: For it is as euill as the Idolatrie, which the godly kings of Iudah did so bend themselues to destroy, and for the destroying whereof they are commended. As for the exemptions which many of our Recusants haue from the penaltie of the lawe, I doubt not, but hoping of doing good, and of winning by faire meanes will be the colour for the same. But I doe see none more obstinate, or of whome there is lesse hope, than such persons as haue found such fauour. Neyther are these disobedient persons at any time so ready to conforme themselues to dutifull obedience, as when they feare some execution of lawes against them. Which thing, because it is so manifest that none can but see it, it maketh many to thinke, that such immunities are procured often vpon other considerations, than hope of winning them vnto Christ. Yea some sue for them sometimes, that perchance hope to winne something to themselues thereby. But of compelling by feare, such to come vnto God, as for loue will not, and of inflicting punishment, where meekenesse and lenitie preuaile not, I am now to intreate: for this is the second point, wherein Magistrates must serue the Lorde. And although I doe not like of extremitie

mitie or rigor: yet so long as wee see remisnesse to bee hurtfull to the church and common wealth, that which saint Augustine calleth a religious severity would be vsed: that is, magistrates ought to take that way, not that best pleaseth their owne humour, but that serueth best for reducing offendours to the seruice of God. If therefore lenitie bee abused, and breed licentious libertie, so that they who were euill, growe worse thereby: then lenitie ceaseth to bee a christian vertue, and is nothing else but that foolish pittie that marreth the whole citie. In these north countries, we haue too good experience heereof. For, meekenesse some call it, but I take it to bee an excessiue want either of care or courage in the Lordes cause, hath brought these countries to that passe, that the sinnes of the countrey, as murder, whoredome, thefts, and spoiling do abound more than euer they did for many yeeres. As for recusants, not men onely and women, but euen in sundry places the children also, either may not, or will not come at the church. And that more is, and to be wondered at, there are that dare reproue them that will performe that duety. And yet the church of Rome hath not much to brag of this their plentifull haruest, as in many of their bookes they doe: for it is full of filthy weedes. For euen the better sort of them rest vpon I knowe not what name of conscience, without any reason of their religion, or ground of their faith. And they being deceiued through their ignorance, doe fall into the pit which false teachers, as ignorant almost as themselues, haue made to catch thē in. And though amongst thē that do profesle religion, there are too many that doe know too little: yet for them to seeme to haue a better perswasion in religion than the common sort, who haue scarce so much knowledge as the common sort hath to ground their religion vpon, is a great skorne. Yea, many there are whose conscience (as it is thought) will serue them, some to take their neighbours horse, cow, ore, or sheepe by stealth, some to beare with, and winke at such as doe such things,

and yet their conscience will not suffer them to come to the church. Others haue conscience, that will suffer them to liue in continuall whoredome, and to lead a most filthie life, euen almost in the sight of the sunne, but to shew themselues dutifull to God and man, it will not suffer them. Seeing therfore that as in a sore, if the surgeon forbear to search it to the quicke, it doth but corrupt and putrifie: so in this our malady, nothing hath so much increased the same as too much lenity: there is now no other way to mend that is amisse, but by some due punishments to beate downe the pride of the obstinate, and to restraine their insolencie. I meane not, that life or limme of anie should be touched for religion only (vnlesse perchaunce the word of God expreslie doe commaund it) for as mildnesse hath been a precious ornament to her maiesties person, So I am well assured that it hath beene as a strong pillar to vpholde her estate. For mercie and truth preserue the king, and his throne shalbe established with mercie: yet would I haue manie pitties rather than one: That is, that one or some few should rather be punished, than whole multitudes by too much gentlenesse should be imboldened to follow that which is euil. Neither are the punishments for religion by our law of such qualitie as that there is iust cause to complaine of the rigour of the same: although the papistes that they may seeme to haue a great number of martyrs and confessours, with manie a loude lie, crie out against the crueltie that is vsed amongst vs. Restraint of libertie only, would not in the late time of persecution in Queene Maries daies, haue beene thought crueltie, when most sharpe and vncomfortable imprisonments, and in the ende cruel death, was thought too little for them that could not be charged with any thing, but onely dissenting in religion from the Church of Rome. The paiment of a little money, would then haue beene thought an easie redemption for the libertie of conscience: and these are the most grieuous punishments, that our lawe in such case hath

Prou. 20. 28.

set

set downe. And that these chastisements should nowe with some severitie be executed, it is high time: when as so many upon a meere will, or to please some other, will not sticke to revolt from that holy profession, which once they followed. Yea, it seemeth unto me a necessarie policie, that that penal statute against recusants should more severely be executed: not onely to haue the greater treasure in store, for the necessarie defence of the realme: but also to withdrawe from hollow hearted subiects, that wherewith they do either unmeasurablie inrich and furnish themselues against that evil day which so long they haue looked for, or in the mean time relieue bad persons to be trumpets of rebellion. For howsoever those lying spirits blow it abroad, that catholiks (for so they falsely tearme them) are in most cruell maner persecuted in England for religion: yet it is most certaine, that there are an infinite number of knowne and stubborne recusants among vs, that feele no smart at all. Which thing also I would wish that by some meanes they might bee made publikely to confesse, thereby to confute and confound the shamelesse slaunders of their lying masters. And such as are imprisoned can not iustly complaine of want of anie thing necessarie, unlesse it be libertie. They are not forced to lie upon the ground, or to sit uneasilie in the stockes, They are not loaden with boltes and fetters, or anie other way cruelly handled, as many good men were in the dayes of our late persecution. No, no, we willingly leaue those cruel torments to the bloudie papists, to that purple Harlot that sitteth at Rome: who is euen drunken with the blood of the saints, and hath a delight to torment and make hauocke of the people of God. To such as Dinothus in his storie of the warres of Fraunce speaketh of: For hee reporteth that when the papists, that sauage generation, had woonne Aurasia, they spared no sexe, no age, no estate, no not sucking babes: they deuised new & those cruell torments (for to kil only cannot suffice that catholike humor.) And towarde women when they were dead, they passed Lib. 8

the limits I will not say of christianitie, or of humane modesty, but they shewed themselues more beastly thā beasts. And that they might the rather be incouraged impudently to commit all these excesses, they had a fit watchword for their purpose which did both shew their meaning and with what spirit they were guided, which was this: I curse god thrice. O catholike watch word! It seemeth they were at defiance not with good men only, but with God also. Of like beastly cruelty also, and shameleſſe despiting of the dead bodies the same authour writeth in the verie latter end of that his second booke: euen such as anie man excepting Romish catholiks would be ashamed to commit. But the more shameles in crueltie that they are, the more like themselues. For if we will beleeue euen their owne stories, we shall find that they alwaies made litle accoumpt of that which is pretious in Gods sight. Such crueltie, I say, beseemeth that popish crue, but we hate and detest the same. We are content if they be not dangerous to the state, that they liue at ease and in libertie also, so long as it confirmeth not themselues in their errour, nor withdraweth other from the true worship of God. Yea, there are who for religion being imprisoned, haue inriched themselues, and increased their reuenues. We only seeke to reforme them, not to torment them, and to lay vpon them gentle chastisements to amende them, not cruell punishments to destroy them. But yet, as I saide before of lawes, that they would bee made for a restraint for all sorts of men and women, so the punishment would be inflicted vpon all in like sort, that offende in like maner. And although I will not take vpon mee to define, whether princes may beare with recusants or not, because they are enemies to God, namely, such as despise wilfully Gods worde, and contemne his Sacraments: yet I may be holde to affirme, that the magistrates who will suffer vnpunished, the breaking of the first table of the commaundements, doe shewe therein no great zeale to their high Lord and master.

And

And here would I wiſh this one poynt to be conſidered vpon, whether it be not verie conuenient and neceſſarie, that wheras God by his law expreſly hath ſet downe that Idolaters ſhould be ſtoned to death, whether (I ſay) the papiſts, whoſe ſeruice and ceremonies, are almoſt nothing elſe but Idolatry and ſuperſtition, ſhould bee iudged according to that law, concerning that point of their religion, wherein they defend and practiſe the worſhiping of Images, and praying to thoſe that are no Gods. Heereby two commodities I doubt not would inſue: Firſt that the papiſts ſhould be knowen to be as they are, Idolaters and worſhippers of falſe gods: which ſinne if the people did know that they were ſubiect vnto, they would neuer be ſo deceiued by them. Secondly, thereby many would be afraied to call vpon ſtockes and ſtones, as now they doe. For to defile the lande with their manifeſt idolatries, why ſhould not wee account it a ſinne worthie of death, ſeeing it is a breach of that commaundement, which eſpecially concerneth the honour of God. Which how feruently and ſincerely we ſhould maintaine, we may among manie other notable preſidents, learne of the children of Iſrael, who with full conſent, did gather themſelues to fight againſt the tribes of Ruben and Gad. and the halfe tribe of Manaſſeh, becauſe they had thought that an altar (which they built for a memoriall, and witneſſe, that the tribes beyond Iordan, worſhipped the ſelfe ſame God, and profeſſed the ſame Religion that the other did) they thought (I ſay) it had beene built, to offer ſacrifices vpon, and ſo to diſhonour God. Which thing rather than they would ſuffer vnreuenged, they would venture their liues. So zealous they were, and wee ſhould be, of Gods honour. For euen to that ende were we created, and that dutie we muſt as louing and obedient children, zealouſly performe to our heauenly father. Yea, ſeeing they account vs as heretikes, in whoſe doctrine neither they, neither yet their fathers, could euer, or yet can, proue by the worde

Deut. 17. 2, 3. 4. 5. 7.

Ioſh. 22.

of

of God, the leaſt ſuſpition of hereſie: to the end that themſelues may be knowen what they are, that thus dare ſlaunder the profeſſours of the trueth without iuſt cauſe. Why ſhould not they whoſe doctrine and doings beeing examined by Gods written worde, doe plainly proue themſelues to be idolaters, why ſhould not they (I ſay) be called idolaters, as in trueth they are. Well, ſeeing it is before plainly proued, that godly princes did make lawes, to reſtraine and reforme the ſinnes of the people, yea, and that in matters of Religion, and haue as it were watched all opportunites, to ſerue the Lord in ſuch ſort (and this I take
Rom. 13. 11. to be that ſeruing of the time, whereunto the Apoſtle exhorteth, for ſo many do read it) I truſt it cannot be denied, but that it belongeth vnto the dutie of Chriſtian magiſtrates to doe the like. And if they may make lawes, may they not alſo puniſh the breakers of the ſame? I haue before ſhewed, that it is neceſſarie (if we conſider our eſtate) that they ſhould. And that it is their part ſo to do, it cannot
Rom. 13. 4. be denied. For He is the miniſter of God to take vengeance of them that doe euill. And what Nehemiah did herein is worthie to be remembred: whoſe authoritie was not very great, being but as it were a captain, yet did he not onely make decrees, as of other matters, ſo alſo concerning
Nehe. 10. 17 the breach of the Sabboth day, (a ſinne too common in England, and too lightly accounted of) but alſo did exe-
20 cute the ſame, yea, and threatned to lay hands vpon them
21 that were cauſe of it, if they made that fault againe. Yea,
2. Chr. 15. 13 did not Aſa commaund them vpon paine of death to turne from their Idols and falſe gods, making this couenant, nay, taking this oath of all Iudah and Beniamin, that Whoſoeuer will not ſeeke the Lorde God of Iſrael, ſhall bee ſlaine whether hee bee ſmall or great, man or woman. Marke, there is in this no reſpect of kinde, or kinred: yea he ſuffered not his owne grandmother to be regent, neither thought her worthie to bee a gouernour, Becauſe ſhee had made an Idoll in a groue: and hee

broke

brake downe her Idoli, and stamped it, and burnt it at the brooke of Kidron. Christian princes and Magistrates should alwayes set such examples before their eies, comparing that which they did, and Gods spirit commendeth in them, with that which they doe, to prouoke themselues thereby in godly zeale to serue the Lord. Nowe therefore seeing I haue indeuoured (as God hath inabled mee) to stirre vp all christian magistrates, more watchfully to regard, and more speedily to redresse, than of late especially hath beene done, the state of religion, growen I knowe not by what negligence, almost into contempt amongst many: I would wish that a chiefe care shoulde bee taken (among many other, to auoyde two verie daungerous conceytes, which are as Scylla, and Caribdis: at one of the which it is an easie matter for all them to make shipwracke of fayth, that striue not to holde fast a good conscience, but withholde the trueth in vnrighteousnesse. The one is poperie, the other is Atheisme. Of papists, and recusants I haue sayde alreadie somewhat. They are too many, and vpon euery small occasion of hope of their bloudie day, verie bolde (whereby we may consider what subiects they are.) They are dangerous snakes to carrie in our bosome. If inquirie should be made how many haue beene presented, that were neuer called before authoritie, and howe many called, that haue beene sent home againe, as free as before they came to the magistrate, and yet as bad also as euer they were, I suppose they will be found manie. And for them that are imprisoned, it is manie times more for the gaine of their keepers, than the reformation of themselues. So that they are almost in no place, more free to doe, or say what they will, than in their prisons, whereby they corrupt many. This fault I trust, is not generall, but in some places it is so. Well, of them I will onely say thus much, that they are in such sort dealt withall, as themselues are much confirmed in popish heresies, they that beare good will to the trueth, much

1. Tim. 1. 19.

Rom. 1. 18.

discouraged

discouraged, and harty and sincere obedience, not to the gospell only but to her Maiestie also is much hindered. As for that godlesse and graceless sorte, who dare saie not in their heart only, but euen with their mouthes also, not priuately, but also in their meetings and assemblies, to their perpetual shame, that there is no God: although they bee nothing so daungerous, as are the Papistes, who deceiue vnder a colour of religion (and therefore more craftilie) such as haue not a loue to the trueth: yet are they of all other creatures most to bee detested as beeing more vnthankefull than the beastes themselues, and to be counted more vile than the dung of the earth, which wee treade vnder our feete: seeing they are so iniurious to that good God, that hath made them such excellent creatures, and doe so by their impiety blemish and defile the excellency of their creation. For, if The eies of all doe waite vppon God, who giueth them meate in due season. Of all I say, euen the beastes, and not men only, then doe they after their manner confesse that there is a God that feedeth them, as hee doeth also, The beastes and young Rauens that crie. And in that all things keepe their course, whereunto God appointed them, it argueth that they yeelde a soueraignetie to that deuine power, that hath created and appointed them to that ende. And shall any man indued with reason, nay such as call themselues Christians, and some of them perchance such as haue receiued of Gods hand, more aboundant graces than many other: shall such I saie, as haue so many causes to knowe and confesse him, dare set themselues against him that made them, and deny his power? In him they liue, and moue, and haue their being, and will they not confesse him? The creation, the preseruation, and the administration which hee vseth ouer all thinges, doeth prooue him to bee God. Yea which waie can we turne our eies, but that we must beholde his power? The heauens declare the glorie of God. And the earth also is full of his greatnesse. They

Atheists.

Psal. 145. 15.

Psal. 147. 9.

Act. 17. 28.

Psal. 19. 1.

that

that goe downe into the sea in shippes, and occupy by great waters, They see the workes of the Lorde, and his wonders in the deepe. In the Scriptures what haue wee but the goodnesse of God, the might of God, the wisedome of God, the iustice of God? To shewe that wee cannot bee without him, and from him wee cannot hide our selues. Much lesse shall that wicked crew stand before him, but that his hande shall finde them out. And although that accursed company will (no doubt) deny the Scriptures, and count them but as fabulous, yet Gods actes and deedes therein contained, as also the storie of all times doeth sufficiently testifie vnto the worlde, that God is wise, mightie, good, and iust. The very heathen men therefore, founde him out by his workes, and could not but confesse that there must be a God: although not seeking to knowe him by his worde, they became vaine in their imaginations, and conceites of this God: But that there is a God, they did all see it. Shall the Scriptures beare witnesse, and his workes testifie of him, yea shall the very heathens finde argumentes enough to conuince them, and make them confesse him, and shall such as are borne and brought vp amongst Christians, bee as blinde as beetels in so cleare light, and so bring a staine to their profession, their country, their blood? God forbid that in any christian common wealth there shoulde bee any founde so wicked and witlesse, as once to thinke so irreligiously. But to speake it, and that not in secret, but in the hearing of others, or to defend it as an opinion that they would haue to be beleeued, is so detestable a sinne before God, as if it bee suffered will be the vtter ruine of this land. Take away the assured persuasion of God, out of the heartes of the people, and how shal obedience be performed to Magistrates, honour to parents, seruice to maisters, or duty to all superiours for the Lordes sake? Let their prophane opinion preuaile, and neither shal the godly haue any incouragement to serue in feare, neither the wicked any bridle to restraine them from euil. These corruptions therefore of a common

Psal. 107. 23. 24.

wealth,

wealth, these enemies to al honest and Christian life, ought not to bee suffered to liue amongst men, much lesse to enioy any estimation or credit by christian Magistrats. Neither can this persuasion once enter into the hearte of any, vnlesse they be such, as because they woulde liue dissolutelie in all lust and pleasure, as the prophet Amos saith, Do put far away the euil day, euē that day of the Lord wherof Sophony speaketh, and of which day the prophet Ioel saith, The day of the Lord is great and very terrible, and who can abide it? And therfore that they might sinne without al feare of God, they would faine perswade themselues that there is no God. Or els such as being drunken in their prosperity, and aduanced perchaunce far aboue their worth, doe thinke as did the wicked men of whom Malachy speaketh, that if there were a God of iustice, it coulde not bee so well with them, and so in their excesse of pride they deny God & say who is Lord? And although I trust that none amongst vs are com to the depth of that impiety: perbecause it is too true, that many will haue such prophane talke, and delight too much therin, & that some of them such as seeme not litle in their own eies: if sharpe punishments be not inflicted, for such irreligious and wicked speeches, themselues will more & more be hardened in their euil, and others more incouraged to like of their vngodlines. Therfore these biles & sores of a common wealth, are of all christians to be shunned as vnworthy to liue among Gods people, & of al godly magistrats, such are to be restrained, not by lawes only, but by the sharpest punishments. And if magistrates would not doe their duty therin (which God forbid) yet let al true christians take heede they touch no such pitch, least they be defiled withit, nor giue eare to such talke, least it corrupt their good manners. Yea let them put away such spottes from their feastes, for the company is the worse that they are in, what account so euer they make of themselues. Withal diligence therefore, inquiry would be made for detecting, and strait order taken for the punishing of such: For as al sinnes procure Gods wrath, especially if they be borne withal, and

Amos. 6. 3. Soph. 1. 7. Ioel. 2. 11.

Mal. 2. 17.

Eccle. 13. 1. 2. Cor. 15. 33. Iud. 12.

God

God in his wrath sendeth his plagues: so especially such great blasphemies as this, as hath with it a manifest contempt of God and his worde, bringeth for the most parte a generall destruction. If Princes therefore bee Gods lieutenantes, and supply his roome, as indeede they doe, if by him they beare rule as Salomon affirmeth, it is their dutie to watch all opportunities, to reforme if it maie be, or else to roote out their maisters enemies, and to imploy their whole power in defence of his glorie, who setteth them in honour, establisheth their authority, subdueth vnto them their subiectes, giueth peace in their lande, when neede is if it seeme good to him, vanquisheth their enemies, to bee shorte, without whom they haue no power. Let it neuer bee saide, that in a lande wherein the gospell is so constantly and zealously professed, and by so many godlie lawes established, it shall bee lawfull for some seduced, but very selfe-willed folkes, such as recusantes are for the most parte, to reiect it without all feare of punishment, or for a prophane crew, such are these Atheistes, to blaspheme God without controlement. If wee loue the truth, let vs with courage set our selues against the enemies therof. If wee feare God truely, let vs also feare to bee partakers of their sinnes that will not acknowledge him. But priuate persons that allowe, or doe not reproue, Magistrates that doe not reforme such sinnes, are partakers thereof. Rowze vp your selues therefore (O Christian magistrats) be zealous in his cause, that is so louing to you. Be faithful vnto him, that neuer deceiued any that trusted in him. Beate downe sinne, maintaine the trueth, cherish the godlie, against all popish heretickes, against all prophane Atheistes, that such as doe euill may feare, and know that Magistrats beare not the sword for naught. Think it to be the best pollicie to serue the Lord sincerely: For so Moses teacheth the Israelites (but his lesson is not of many politickes well learned) Keepe therefore (saith he) and do them, for that is your wisedome: And that it is no wisdome to be colde or careleste in Gods cause, for it procureth

Prou. 8. 15.

Rom. 13. 4.

Deut. 4. 6.

his

his wrath, for Cursed be he that doeth the worke of the Lorde negligently. Yea and when God will haue his
Ierem.48.10. iudgementes sharpely executed, Cursed be he that keepeth backe his sworde from bloud. And as those are accursed, that doe not execute those sharpe iudgementes of God, against his enemies: so shall not they bee free from wrath, that are too remisse in inflicting of gentler punishmentes when occasion requireth. Serue the Lorde therefore, and he wil saue you. Defend his cause, and he wil defend you. Rest not vpon your owne strength or pollicie: do his wil faithfully, and he will not faile you. So shal you bring safety and quietnesse to your selues, and Gods blessing vpon your people. Whereas on the contrary if such despisers of God and his trueth, be not in some reasonable sort bridled and reformed, God is by such want of zeale prouoked, the offendours by such remissnesse are incouraged in their euil, and manie not euill persons are much discouraged, from their dutiful obedience to God and man. The Lord therefore open the eies of our christian Magistrates, and giue them wisedome, that they maie see and wisely consider, of these things. The Lorde I say, by his holie spirite worke in their heartes so earnest a zeale to Gods trueth, that they may, as in duty they ought, seeke sincerely to maintaine the same, and to growe not in knowledge
Psal.78.72. onlie and outwarde profession, but in practise also and holy conuersation. That as Dauid did feede the people, according to the simplicity of his heart, and guide them, by the discretion of his handes: so they may walke euery one in their place and calling, vprightly, and with a sincere hearte before the Lorde, to guide their people in the good waies, & to bring them to the wholsome pastures, that they and we their subiects may with one heart serue Christ our Lord here, and raigne with him else-where: to whom with the father and the holyghost be al honor and glory now and for euer.

FINIS.

A Short Answer to the Reasons, which commonly the Popish Recusants in these North parts alleadge, why they will not come to our Churches.

By FRANCIS BVNNY,
Sometime fellow of Magdalen college in Oxford.

Ecclesiastes 4.13.

Better is a poore and wise childe, than an olde and fooliſh King, which wil no more be admoniſhed.

AT LONDON
Printed by V. S. for Rafe Iacſon, dwelling in Paules Church-yard, at the ſigne of the white Swanne.

1595.